

THE INTRODUCTION.

“ My heart was hot within me, and while I was thus musing the fire kindled: and at last I spake with my tongue.”—PSALM xxxix. 3.

“ Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy.”—PROVERBS xxxi. 9.

People who have an indifferent or a weak cause to support, endeavour to catch at anything to uphold and to improve their position, they often also attempt to lessen the force of the complaints made against them by attributing various false motives to their opponents: and thus it is with many of those who take the part of the Trustees of the Molyneux Asylum. It has been sometimes said, “ If reform was needed, what occasion was there for bringing all such matters in print before the public—would it not have been more Christianlike and considerate if Mr. Allnutt had, in the first instance, privately seen and remonstrated with the Trustees? The subject would then have been looked into and amended. We reply, this was tried, and tried in vain, and it was only when there appeared no prospect of reform that the *Address* was published—nay, further, the abuses which have now become so patent would not have been so widely known, had the Trustees bestirred themselves after the issue of the *Address*. Had they then met and acted according to the trust deed, the reform could have been effected by them without such painful disclosures, but it appears that after being torpid for so many years it required no slight amount of time to rouse themselves. Mr. Bickerstaff (a young Trustee, as he calls himself) told Mr. Allnutt (see page 54) that he also had suggested reforms, but was *always put down*; and he added that it was entirely owing to his efforts that a Report was printed after years of silence. What could Mr. Allnutt have flattered himself to effect if a Trustee could do nothing? Therefore, should any suppose that no efforts were made quietly and in a most friendly spirit in the first instance, they are greatly mistaken; that this was done will appear evident from the following copy of a letter forwarded to Mr. Ferrier (the then leading Trustee), some time in the spring of 1854, when this gentleman was on a visit in Dublin:—

[Written about April or May, 1854.]

SIR,—I am anxious to write to you on the subject of the Molyneux Asylum for Blind Females, as I believe you are the leading Trustee. I trust you will not disregard this communication merely on account of its emanating from a person of no influence, for I can assure you there are many gentlemen of the highest respectability who entirely coincide with the views I entertain, but they have not time to trouble themselves on the subject.

It is a matter of complaint that no accounts or reports are published of the state of the Funds and Institution generally. It is true we could see the accounts by calling on Mr. Harris, but it is not to be expected that people will go out of their way to look at accounts; still every subscriber should have laid before him some account of the expenditure, and it is pleasing and satisfactory to have an annual statement.

These Reports were *formerly* printed, for I have one showing the expenditure in 1827-28-29. We hear that the funds are very much decreasing; this cannot be a matter of surprise whilst the affairs of the Institution are kept so close. You have only about 250 subscribers, assuredly this number could be doubled if more active steps were taken.

Then again, is it not to be deplored that so excellent an Institution does not advance. I find that in the Report I have alluded to, in 1829 the number of the inmates was 27, and now you have but 29. Last year there were about 42 poor applicants, and only two could be elected, and this year it seems doubtful if the funds will admit of the entrance of one poor woman. Surely such a state of things cannot be satisfactory to the Trustees. Your Institution cannot be prosperous until more energy is shown—it exists, but is not thriving by any means. I have before me the Report for the Glasgow Blind Institution. There cannot be a greater contrast between the working of that Institution and the Molyneux. In the former the poor people are taught a variety of employments, especially that of reading. It is scarcely to be credited that the younger girls at least are not taught to read in your Asylum. They do nothing but knit from day to day. I could say very much more but I refrain. However I trust that what I have written may have some little effect. If the Trustees desire the Institution to prosper and be a credit to Dublin they should have an Annual General Meeting, and form a Managing Committee of such active, respectable men as Mr. Cathcart, Mr. Sutton, Dr. Ireland, Dr. Bigger, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Gallie, Mr. Parker, &c., and there should be an active and zealous Hon. Secretary; for Mr. Fleury, having his school to attend to, really cannot afford to devote more time than he at present gives to the Asylum.

I could mention many other things—such as the greater prospect of having bequests and donations if your annual reports were well circulated. I do earnestly hope you will take some steps in the matter.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

HENRY ALLNUTT.

Mr. Allnutt was favoured with no reply to this communication, but the only notice taken of it was exhibited in the following manner:—

It has been the custom from the very foundation of the Asylum that the inmates occasionally visit their friends. It was never intended by its founders that the Asylum should become a prison. It was, we say, always usual in the Molyneux Asylum (and it is also the practice of other similar institutions) for the inmates to go and see their friends. In the evidence of the inmates, p. 40, &c., it will be seen that it was a common occurrence, and Miss Allnutt had some of them to spend the evening; on one occasion seven of the poor blind women went to tea and spend the evening with her and Mr. Allnutt; they were taken and brought back in covered cars: but, after this letter was written to Mr. Ferrier, when this lady sent a note to the matron, to request that three of the women might be allowed to come and spend the evening with her, she replied she was sorry she was not allowed to give permission to any of the inmates to accept Miss Allnutt's kind invitation. Mr. Allnutt applied to Mr. Bickerstaff, and in vain pointed out how

unkind it was to prevent two or three of the poor old women having a little innocent recreation, and Mr. Bickerstaff recommended him to write to the Board on the subject. On the approach of Christmas-day, 1854, Mr. Allnutt wrote again to Mr. Ferrier, who had returned to England, and requested that Margaret Roberts, Susannah, the organist, and Mary M'Donnell, or Letty Lawless (women who had been in the Asylum upwards of 35 years) might be allowed to spend the evening at his house. Mr. Ferrier in reply said he really could not interfere in the matter, *he was not one of the acting Trustees*, and he expressed his thanks to Mr. Allnutt for exhibiting such kindly feelings towards the inmates.

Mr. Allnutt again applied to Mr. Bickerstaff, and he appeared rather annoyed, declaring that Mr. Ferrier was quite as much an acting Trustee as he was. In fact there appeared no means of approaching the Trustees.

Shortly after this occurrence, Mr. Allnutt became interested about a poor blind girl, of the name of Anne Burnett, who had before this period been a candidate for election, but had been unsuccessful; having her situation explained to him, he commenced canvassing for votes thus early to be in time for the Election that was expected to take place in May. Cards were lithographed as follows:—

MOLYNEUX ASYLUM, DUBLIN.

ANNE BURNETT,

Recommended by the Rev. H. WILSON, Incumbent, Forguey, Co. Longford.
Nominated by HENRY ALLNUTT, Esq., Fair View, Dublin.

I wish to vote for the admission of ANNE BURNETT at
the ensuing Election.

Dated day of 1855.

These cards were accompanied by a statement of facts showing how destitute and deserving an object this poor woman was. Mr. Allnutt wrote to Mr. Fleury, the Chaplain, on the subject, but no notice was taken. In the course of one of Mr. Allnutt's visits to the Asylum he went up stairs, and saw a dear little child who had been ill for many weeks, and was most surprised to find no fire in the room. No one spoke to Mr. Allnutt on this subject, neither did the poor little child or any of the inmates complain; but, when he returned home, he wrote kindly and politely to Mr. Fleury to suggest the necessity of a fire in the room of the little invalid, not alone for the benefit and comfort of the child, who had lain week after week on her narrow little bed in this large room, having old and ill-fitting windows, but it was most trying to the other inmates who attended on this poor little girl so assiduously until her death. We all have reason to remember this exceedingly cold winter. What sort of a reply did Mr. Allnutt receive to his well-intentioned

letter? No complaint indeed, but thanks as far as related to the offer of paying for the fire, although the offer was declined for very inadequate reasons; but a letter literally abusing him and all the friends of Ann Burnett, calling their exertions *jobbery*. It will be observed in the following letter, that when Mr. Fleury saw the child, she was in the matron's room *where there was a fire*. The little child did not get better, but died not very long afterwards.

24, Upper Leeson-street, Jan., 26, 1855.

DEAR FRIEND—Our little invalid is much better, and will soon be able to remove to the warm work-room. We usually keep no fires in the dormitories, as *it is dangerous* when the patients or inmates are blind, and unable to guard against accidents, or protect their clothes from taking fire. When the little one was *up* at first she was removed to Miss Hines's room. where I saw her last sitting by the fire.

Of course the Trustees will be very much obliged when I communicate to them your generosity. They are very thoughtful men, and regulated by a Trust Deed in all things.—[Query—How far from the truth is this statement.]

You wrote to me some days ago about some blind girl, *Burnett*, I think. The excitement on this subject has given much annoyance and embarrassment. *There is to be no election for a long time to come*, till midsummer, and the canvass set on foot, as if from the *Molyneux Asylum*, in her favour! has damaged her cause greatly.

First—It has created a great deal of trouble to the Trustees and to me, by applications and correspondence, and *confusion*, as if there was going to be an election when there is not!

And, secondly—It has appeared to disinterested people so *odd* that from the *Molyneux Asylum* a *partial* application should issue, *that they have resolved to vote against her admission, and so neutralize any partiality or jobbery*.

Yours very affectionately,

C. M. FLEURY.

If you have any acquaintance with the friends or ill-judging patrons of the poor girl, try and point out to them what mischief they are doing, and what annoyance they have given *me* and the *Trustees*.

It is well to say that Mr. Allnutt had been a subscriber and pew-holder nearly all the time he resided in Dublin, he had also given a donation of Five Pounds to the Asylum. This donation would never have been alluded to but to show that the interest he took in the Asylum was not merely in words, the feeling of regard towards the well-being of the Institution was sincere on his part. Mr. Allnutt, entertaining these sentiments, was astonished and hurt at the receipt of Mr. Fleury's letter—from one he so very highly esteemed—he could not but feel acutely the insult to his efforts, and he wrote the following letter to Mr. Fleury in reply:—

MY DEAR SIR—I am glad to hear that little Mary is so much better. You know I only offered to pay for the fire whilst she was confined to her bed-room, and, in that case, an iron guard would make all quite safe. I am happy, however, to hear that there will be no necessity for such steps.

I really cannot avoid saying that the other contents of your letter, respecting Anne Burnett, have taken me greatly by surprise, and I feel hurt beyond measure, that you should designate the exertions we are making to get her into the Asylum as *jobbery*. Partiality, no doubt, we feel, but I, for

one, cannot submit, even from you, to remain under the imputation of *jobbery* in the matter of getting a blind girl into the Molyneux. The word is so common in Ireland, that it appears you even cannot escape making use of it. Though the word in this instance is most singularly misapplied. You say, "*if you have any acquaintance with the friends and patrons of the poor girl.*" We, Englishmen, like no roundabout proceeding. Do you not know that I am one of those most active for her? Why, I wrote and told you this long since. Really, a Christian should not be afraid to speak to another, and I must tell you plainly that you do yourself an injury, and you are quite wrong about the canvassing coming from the Molyneux. The heading of the card I got lithographed has those words on it, for it is in that place we want to get her admitted. Surely, you would not have the card headed "*Mercer's Hospital.*" I beg to remind you that the papers stating the case of Anne Joice were also headed the same way.

I look upon it every member of the Institution has an undoubted right to propose who he pleases; and, further, that he has a right to canvass for her when and how he pleases. It would be too late, and quite useless to canvass immediately before the election.

One thing strikes me most forcibly throughout your letter, that you shut your eyes to the fact that several ladies, I hear at least seven, are canvassing for Callaghan; and if you complain of the words Molyneux Asylum being at the top of our card, we may, with far more reason, complain of your name being pressed into the service for the other party. Before I say this, however, I should call on the seven ladies working for Callaghan, for perhaps you have administered as sharp a rebuke to them as to me.

My dear Sir, I with pain see you have been needlessly disturbed by this matter. I would with pleasure hold out the hand of Christian fellowship to Miss Jackson, and the other ladies who are trying to get their candidate elected; *no ill will need exist between us*, and I am deeply grieved that the frailty of human nature should have got the better of your understanding. I request you will be good enough to explain, if you can, how I am to be accused of *jobbery*. Do you suppose the poor woman will give me, or any of her friends, any money for our exertions? The thing is perfectly ridiculous. Am I to convey the contents of your letter to the Hon. K. Harman, Lady Molyneux, Mr. Guinness, and a hundred others, who are Anne Burnett's "*ill-judging*" friends? Professions of Christianity will avail us nothing, if we do not endeavour, with God's grace, to practice what we profess. What a specimen of Christian feelings is such a sentiment as this. The blind girl, Anne Burnett, no doubt, is a deserving object, but because her friends have been over anxious, and have exerted themselves too energetically, we are resolved to vote against her admission, (your own words,) and so neutralize any partiality. The Lord preserve us from such feelings. You neutralize this partiality to one to be partial to another. My heart aches to have received such a letter from one I so highly esteemed. I am not, however, a whit less the friend of Anne Burnett for all this.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

HENRY ALLNUTT.

No further letter passed then between the parties. If Mr. Fleury did not intend to convey such unkind impressions, nothing would have been easier than to have written a short note of explanation or have withdrawn words so offensive to *a dear friend*. Nothing of the kind was attempted, in fact the act was aggravated by letters written in the same singular style to the Rev. H. Wilson, the proposer of Anne Burnett, in reply to an expostulatory letter he also sent to Mr. Fleury. Under these circumstances it could not be supposed that Mr. Allnutt would continue attending the Molyneux Chapel—how could he expect to derive advantage from Mr.

Fleury's preaching—we should respect and esteem the party who professes to guide us. Mr. Allnutt felt great regard for the Chaplain hitherto, but his feelings were outraged; so far as concerned the poor inmates, Mr. Allnutt's interest remained unabated, and his eyes began to be opened as to the Institution; in short, Mr. Fleury's strange conduct impressed Mr. Allnutt with a most anxious desire to know more about the affairs of the Asylum; yet, as he was desirous that Anne Burnett should be elected, he postponed further inquiry for above a year, until this object was attained, which occurred only in April last. The particulars of this election and the very singular subsequent proceedings will be found in page 27, and should be carefully perused. Although Mr. Allnutt had written the "*Address*," he took no steps to have it printed until after the Annual Charity Sermon in May, being anxious that his pamphlet should not lessen the contributions, and it may again be repeated that he really had no idea at that time that things were so badly managed, and so opposite to the express provisions of the Trust Deed. We especially beg to remind our readers that no allusion whatever was made in the "*Address*" to Mr. Fleury's conduct, or even that Mr. Allnutt had written and spoken to the Trustees on the subject of the various reforms needed. We should not have given all these particulars so fully, but it appears necessary that the subscribers should be clearly convinced that we are justified in the steps we have taken; we desire that nothing we say may be taken for granted, we invite inquiry; for the more the matter is looked into, we are sorry to add, the worse the management of the Asylum appears, and the more well founded our complaints.

Now, some of our friends having read the excellent, temperate, and clear statement that has lately emanated from the Committee of Gentlemen anxious to reform the Molyneux Asylum, may consider our present pamphlet a work of supererogation, still it is required to fill up many gaps, and we shall endeavour to exhibit the truth in a clearer light. It is necessary, for truth's sake, to be very explicit, and we cannot avoid giving names as the authority for what we assert.

The statement of the Committee does not throw light on the commencement of the movement for Reform, such as we have narrated, and it does not allude to the mode in which Elections are managed, a specimen of which we shall lay before our readers.

The Statement does not state clearly that after the Trustees agreed to act contrary to the usual practice of the Asylum and admit Mr. Fleury's candidate without an Election (although there had already been two inmates elected), on condition that £150 should be collected in two months, that the said trustees did not wait the two months or *even one week* for the amount to be collected, but Mary Callaghan was put into the Asylum *at once*, in the hope that

the money would be collected ; in truth there was not more than half this amount subscribed in three months. Then again the Committee speak but very lightly about the charges preferred against the Matron, although they entertain an opinion diametrically opposite to that of the Trustees. The Trustees would have us believe that they experienced considerable difficulty in coming to a decision, for, in their Manifesto of the 24th November last, they said they were two days reviewing four days' [it should have been three days] evidence. The Committee say truly that out of twenty inmates who were examined, eighteen confirmed the charges, and only two declared that these things did not occur—one of these women was of weak intellect and the other was the *pet of the accused party*.

We have introduced the grocer's account for one quarter of a year ; especial attention is requested to articles obtained during the thirteen weeks, and it will be seen that the custom of the Asylum has been withdrawn from Mr. Falkner (page 56).

The Assistant-Matron was dismissed soon after the inquiry. The Rev. H. V. White was obliged to leave the Asylum, although *for three months* no other clergyman took his position.

No one is allowed to see or speak to the inmates without the Matron being present. The hours for visiting the Asylum have been altered from Eleven to Four o'clock in the afternoon, to from Eleven to Two o'clock ! and we believe the inmates are scarcely allowed to go and see any of their friends, at least without a previous examination before the Board of Trustees !

Important announcement printed on a Black Board, stuck up in the Hall of the Molyneux Asylum, copied 5th instant (March, 1857):—

Ordered by the Trustees, that all communications between the Visitors and the Inmates be held in the work-room only, and in the presence of the Matron, between the hours of eleven and two o'clock.

December 15, 1856.

The mere substitution of the word "Turnkey" for "Matron" would make this a fit notice for a gaol.

We really feel compelled to say a few words on the "*gross calumny*" alluded to in page 9 of the Committee's Statement—"that the writer of the Address was mad." Mr. Allnutt did not really care so much about these ridiculous reports, as far as he himself was concerned, but it might injure the cause he had in hand,—these reports were circulated for some time before he knew of them, and hearing the source from whence they were said to have come, Mr. Allnutt wrote the following letter to Mr. Fleury:—

20th June, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am given to understand that you have said very broadly to several parties that I am not in my right mind, that in fact, I am "*mad*." The matter is laughable enough, but, at the same time, when I know that you have spoken to my medical man on the subject, I think it due to myself and family that I require from you some explanation.

I should indeed be extremely sorry to feel called upon to act in any way unfriendly towards you, but assertions such as appear to have been made by you to others respecting me, are rather beyond a joke. Requesting your early reply, I am, dear sir, yours truly,

HENRY ALLNUTT.

(Mr Fleury's reply.)

24, Upper Leeson-street, June 21st, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR,—I received your letter this morning; conversation is an imperfect mode of communicating, and a report of it is seldom exact; my conversation with — amounted merely to a friendly inquiry after your health! The last time we visited you together you were far from well. The last time I had the pleasure of meeting you before you left the Molyneux Chapel, you seemed to me hardly recovered, since then I have had no opportunity of intercourse with you, saving the day of the Molyneux Election, when few or no words passed between us. I am, therefore, not competent to pronounce any absolute opinion on your general health and state of mind, and as I said before, the drift and amount of my conversation with — was to inquire after your welfare. Wishing you all happiness, I remain, yours very sincerely,

C. F. FLEURY.

P.S.—I assure you I have no intention to joke at the expense of your feelings.

This was not deemed satisfactory, and Mr. Allnutt requested his solicitor to write to Mr. Fleury, and to say that although he did not deny having circulated the reports against Mr. Allnutt, yet he expressed no regret for so doing, and that if he did not apologize Mr. A. would take further steps in the matter. Mr. Belas then called on Mr. Allnutt's solicitor, but nothing further was done. In explanation, it may be necessary to say that Mr. Allnutt had the small-pock in June, 1854, and that Mr. Fleury saw him one afternoon,* when he was delirious for a few hours, before the complaint developed itself. This is what Mr. Fleury alludes to when he says he was "*far from well*," but in the following sentence he says "the last time I had the pleasure of seeing you, before you left the Molyneux Chapel, you seemed to me *hardly recovered*;" really it should be known that Mr. Allnutt left the chapel after the receipt of Mr. Fleury's letter of 26th January, 1855 (see page 6), so that Mr. Fleury inferred that the same delirium under which Mr. Allnutt suffered in June, 1854, from the small-pock, was hardly removed in February, 1855, eight months after, when Mr. Allnutt, it is needless to say, was as well as any one. Mr. Fleury's saying he was not competent to pronounce any absolute opinion on Mr. Allnutt's general health and state of mind is really rather amusing—who applied to Mr. Fleury for an opinion on the subject?

* Mr. Allnutt little thought when he received a visit from his friend and minister, that Mr. Fleury would turn the visit to such an account.

TO THE

Friends and Subscribers of the
MOLYNEUX ASYLUM.

At the time of the publication of the "*Address*," before the copies had left the Printer's hands, a most material circumstance occurred, namely, the Author of the "*Address*" obtained a copy of the *Trust Deed*, by which the Molyneux Asylum should be regulated. So very important did its contents appear that he was desirous of adding a postscript to his pamphlet, stating that he had just discovered, by the *Trust Deed*, that the Asylum was directly and entirely established for the reception of Blind Females above a certain age, and as a school for blind girls, and that the paragraph in page 12 was incorrect, in assuming that the Asylum was only taken in hand for the purpose of having a Church in that locality; the perusal of this document clearly settled that point, and it rendered the appointment of fifteen ladies as a body of Visiting-Ladies *imperative*; and further, that there were other matters of vital importance in the *Trust Deed* entirely over looked, or totally disregarded by the Trustees now in being, however former Trustees may have acted. The writer of the "*Address*" was recommended to omit this postscript, and to let the Trustees themselves discover and reflect how widely they were acting from the provisions of their *Deed*, and so reform themselves. Under these circumstances the pamphlet appeared without any such addition. We cannot now wonder that nothing was attempted by the Trustees; some of them had *never seen the Trust Deed*, and were, in other respects, totally ignorant of the management of the Asylum.

Five hundred copies of the "*Address*" were struck off; and very quickly absorbed by the Subscribers, and the public who felt an interest in the Asylum. Copies were forwarded without delay to the Trustees, and in the course of a few days, the Author received the following note from Mr. Alexander Ferrier, the senior Trustee:—

Newstead, Torquay, Devon, May 29, 1856.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 26th, also a copy of the "*Address*." I can only say, that I am sure the Trustees must feel obliged for any suggestion tending to improve the Institution, and that your letter and address will receive mature consideration. You will excuse me for adding that I cannot understand how a real friend of the Institution could print and publish such an "*Address*."

I remain, very truly yours,

HENRY ALLNUTT, Esq.

(Signed), ALEXANDER FERRIER.

(Mr Allnutt's Reply.)

30th May, 1856, Middle Abbey-street.

DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your note, but I find an observation towards the close of it, I am bound to reply to, you say “you cannot understand how a real friend of the Institution could print and publish such an Address.”

You make a little mistake in supposing I printed the Address, but I wrote it, and what else could I do? I addressed a letter to you above a twelve month back, I have also spoken to another Trustee, but no notice whatever was taken; and now you blame me for taking more active steps. Your Secretary told the Hon. King Harman at the Election that the Trustees would not publish another account for five years; and that you did not care if you lost £10 by so doing; no real friend to the Asylum could be satisfied to let matters run that course. Why; if you went on this year as last, you would be about £500 behind hand next May. Believe me, Sir, you are quite mistaken if you suppose others do not feel as I do, as respects the want of a proper management over the Asylum, but so many people *are afraid to speak*. I can tell you one thing, that if the Trustees do not take steps to set matters in order, other statements will issue far more entering into detail, and far more painful than has yet been said on the subject. How is it the Trustees permit Mr. Fleury to enter into the establishment of a very large school, when the Trust Deed expressly declares that under no circumstances whatever is the Chaplain to be in any other situation or profession? How is it the Trustees are on the point of taking in Mary Callaghan, without a proper and regular Election? Did not the Trustees decline to take in a woman named by the late Lord Lorton, although his Lordship offered to pay a certain sum; the Trustees acted quite right then, and now, because Mary Callaghan is Mr. Fleury's candidate, they completely disregard all rules (if really there are any), and take her into the Asylum; there is now something going forward in the Asylum that calls for immediate and searching inquiry. It would be well, if you could come to Dublin, and meet the Gentlemen who are interested in the Molyneux.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

ALEXANDER FERRIER, Esq.,

HENRY ALLNUTT.

Torquay, England.

We believe no other Trustee made any communication on the subject, but in the course of about a month, as there appeared no prospect of their calling a meeting, or taking any steps for the reformation of the Asylum, a Letter was addressed to each of the Trustees, requesting a meeting would be convened to which we could be invited; we are bound to say that very courteous replies were received from most of these gentlemen:—one said, he would not only esteem it a pleasure, but a privilege to meet the friends of the Asylum;—in fact, so far all appeared as favorable as we could desire; but in a short time, we began to experience difficulties—Mr. Armstrong was going on professional business to the North of Ireland; another Trustee was also leaving Dublin, or deeply engaged, whilst other partners in the firm were absent; and then again, these gentlemen said, they would not like to meet us until Mr. Ferrier came from England. After a while this Trustee visited Dublin, and we understand from good authority made two or three investigations at the Molyneux.

In a short time, in renewing our application to Mr. Ferrier for a meeting to be held, we were informed that the first Gentleman referred to, *was not yet returned to Dublin, and indeed would not be back for a month from that time*; and that it would be well for him, Mr. Ferrier, also to embrace that opportunity, and go and see some friends in the North; that, in short, it was not probable the Trustees could meet us until some time in August. We could not feel satisfied with these great delays, and inquiry being made we found that Mr. Armstrong, the Trustee alluded to, *had actually returned to Dublin*. On this we wrote again to Mr. Ferrier, and there now being every prospect of our meeting the Trustees, we felt surprised to receive the following medical certificate from Mr. Ferrier's son-in-law:—

15, Stephen's-green, July 7, 1856.

MY DEAR BIGGER,—Your deputation must excuse Mr. Ferrier from an interview; he is not well—is under my care, and I have forbidden it. Besides, he has resigned his Trusteeship, positively and definitively.

Yours, very truly,

F. CHURCHILL.

Had this Trustee resigned when in England, and before he had made the inquiries at the Molyneux, we should not complain, but it must be remarked that he only discovered at this particular juncture he was unable to act as a Trustee, and he then abruptly left his brother Trustees to do as best they could. It would appear that formerly Mr. Ferrier, when residing in Dublin, was one of the most active Trustees; and he took on himself more responsibility than any other gentleman,—however on the resignation of Mr. Ferrier, we wrote again to the Trustees, and eventually Mr. Armstrong named Friday, the 11th of July, for the meeting to take place, at four o'clock in the afternoon, at the Asylum. We received this letter on Tuesday, the 8th, and immediately communicated its contents to those gentlemen who felt an interest in this reformation movement. Most strange to say on the 9th, the Hon. Secretary of the Reforming Committee received the following note from Mr. Harris, (*a clerk in Mr. Ferrier's establishment in William-st.,*) to postpone the meeting of the 11th:—

William-street, 9th July, 1856.

DOCTOR BIGGER—DEAR SIR,—The meeting intended to be held on Friday evening next, at four o'clock, at the Molyneux Asylum, is unavoidably postponed to some early day next week, of which due notice will be given.

Please inform Mr. Parker and Mr. Allnutt.—Yours truly,

JOSH. HARRIS.

Dr. Bigger instantly replied that he could not take on himself to write to our friends not to attend, and in due time the memorable 11th of July arrived. We beg here to observe that the Trustees one and all declared that it was not with their sanction or knowledge, that Mr. Harris penned this epistle, (see page 34).

Cash Account from 10th Report for the year ending 1st April, 1829.

| RECEIVED. | | PAID. | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|
| | £ s. d. | | £ s. d. |
| Donations | 8 0 0 | Maintenance ... | 295 9 11 |
| Subscriptions ... | 190 17 3 | Clothing ... | 27 16 1 |
| Collection at Charity Sermon, May, 1828 ... | 157 5 4 | Coals, Candles, and Oil ... | 51 4 9 |
| Chapel Collections ... | 239 12 11 | Materials for Work ... | 38 3 10 |
| Pew Rents ... | 150 12 6 | Salaries, viz.— | |
| Rent of Houses in Bride-street | 40 14 3 | Rev. J. C. Lloyd ... | 150 0 0 |
| Work of Inmates sold ... | 60 8 0 | Matron, Chapel Clerk, Sexton, and House Servants ... | 119 2 7 |
| Legacy of the late Geo. Burgess, on account ... | 48 1 6 | Apothecary ... | 10 0 0 |
| Ditto Dr. Barrett ... | 38 9 0 | Collector, 5 per cent. on amount received... .. | 17 10 0 |
| Ditto Lady Hutchinson | 16 5 4 | Insurance ... | 10 10 5 |
| Psalm Books sold ... | 2 15 0 | Furniture ... | 10 17 6 |
| Produce of Bazaar at Rotundo, per Mrs. Cheyne ... | 27 9 5 | Repairs ... | 47 0 2 |
| | 980 10 6 | Printing and Advertisements | 13 13 0 |
| Balance in Treasurer's hands | | Rent ... | 100 0 0 |
| at last Annual Audit ... | 13 14 3½ | Music and Instruction ... | 20 7 0 |
| | | Contingencies ... | 21 15 7 |
| | | Cash borrowed last year ... | 50 0 0 |
| | | | 983 10 10 |
| | | Balance in Treasurer's hands, April, 1829 ... | 10 13 11½ |
| | £994 4 9½ | | £994 4 9½ |

We, the Auditors, have examined the above Account, and do find a Balance in hands of Treasurers, of Ten Pounds Thirteen Shillings and Eleven Pence Halfpenny, on the 1st April, 1829, as therein stated. We also find a Debt of One Hundred and Twenty Pounds, Irish Currency, Cash borrowed in 1825, remaining a charge on the Institution.

Board Room, Peter-street, 23rd February, 1830.

HENRY CHAS SIRR,
WILLIAM FLEMING.

1830.

MOLYNEUX ASYLUM FOR BLIND FEMALES.

Under the Protection of
Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent.

Patron :

Sir Capel Molyneux, Baronet.

Guardians :

Right Hon. Viscountess Lorton* | Lady Molyneux.

Clerical Trustees :

Rev. William Bushe, Rector of St. George's. | Rev. George Hamilton, Rector of Killermogh.
Rev. Robert Daly, Rector of Powerscourt.

Lay Trustees :

Alexander Ferrier, Esq., Fishamble-st. | William C. Hogan, Esq., York-street.
William Lunell Guinness, Esq., Mount-joy-square, North. | Charles Moore, Esq., South Anne-street.

Chaplains :

Rev. Piers Edmund Butler, A.B.
Rev. J. C. Lloyd, A.B., Dom. Chaplain to the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aldborough.
Treasurers :—Sir Robert Shaw, Bart. & Co. | *Surgeon* :—Samuel Wilmot, Esq., M.D., York-street.
Physician :—William Stoker, Esq., M.D., York-street. | *Apothecary* :—Mr. S. Clindennin, Baggot-street.

Visitors :

Mrs. Butler, Molyneux Asylum. | Mrs. Moore, Anne-street.
Mrs. Byrne, Hatch-street. | Mrs. M'Master, Rathmines.
Miss Barton, Baggot-street. | Mrs. Palliser, Stephen's-green.
Miss L. Brown, Upper Baggot-street. | Miss Peile, York-street.
Mrs. Darley, William-street. | Mrs. Stevelly, Peter-street.
Mrs. Alexander Ferrier, Rathmines. | Mrs. Shears, Peter-street.
Miss Hayes, Fitzwilliam-square. | Miss Scriven, Harcourt-street.
Mrs. Leslie, Woodly, Dundrum. | Mrs. White, Camden-street.
Mrs. J. C. Lloyd, Peter-place. | Miss Wight, Baggot-street.
Miss Lloyd, Merrion-square.

Honorary Visitors :

Mrs. Cheyne, Merrion-square. | Mrs. Hogan, Milltown.
Mrs. Clarke, Russell-place. | Mrs. Wilmot, Stephen's-green.
Mrs. W. L. Guinness, Mountjoy-square.

Chapel Clerk and Collector :

Mr. William George Hulbert, 45, Charlemont-street.
Matron :—Miss Cluff. | *Work Mistress* :—Miss O'Brien.

* The mother of the Hon. L. H. King Harman, one of the Authors of this Pamphlet.

1855.

MOLYNEUX ASYLUM FOR BLIND FEMALES.

Patron :

Sir Capel Molyneux, Bart.

Trustees :

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Cashel, Waterford, &c. | Charles Moore, Esq. |
| Rev. W. Cleaver. | W. Watson, Esq. |
| Rev. C. S. Stanford, D.D. | W. Armstrong, Esq., Q.C. |
| Alexander Ferrier, Esq. | L. Bickerstaff, Esq. |

Chaplain :

Rev. Charles M. Fleury, A.M.

Assistant Chaplain :

Rev. O. J. Vignoles, A.M.

Treasurers :

The Royal Bank, Foster-place.

Physician :

F. Churchill, Esq., M.D., Stephen's-green.

Surgeon and Oculist :

R. Wilde, Esq., F.R.S.I.

Apothecary :

William D. Moore, Esq., A.B., 8, South Anne-street.

Matron :

Miss Hines.

Assistant Secretary and Collector :

Mr. T. Evans.

On Friday afternoon, 11th July last, we met, in the Board-room of the Asylum, some three or four of the Trustees, namely, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Moore, Mr. Watson (we believe), and the Rev. Dr. Stanford, with several other gentlemen who were Subscribers, or Pew-holders. [We understand the Trustees had a private meeting between themselves, an hour or so earlier that morning.]

Dr. Bigger opened the proceedings, and commenced by saying that some parties had charged Mr. Allnutt with writing two pamphlets, such was not the case, only one "*Address*" had been written, but a few proofs had been laid before some friends for correction, and also for the purpose (if they thought proper) of adding their names to the pamphlet to show their concurrence in the movement.

The first thing complained of was the extremely vague and loose manner in which the last Report had been drawn up, — it was entitled the Thirteenth Report. We had been at considerable pains to discover the previous reports; and the only one we could procure was that published in 1830, which was called the Tenth.

Dr. Bigger handed this Report to Mr. Armstrong, who declared he had never before *seen this*, or *any Report of the Asylum* (an announcement rather surprising from a Trustee.) Dr. Bigger continued to say that the Report, especially after such a lapse of time, should contain information as to the number of inmates; the nature of their employment; whether the younger inmates were taught to read; the capabilities of the Asylum as to its further usefulness; and those interesting statistical details so well calculated to induce a charitable public to support the Institution more liberally; this information was always looked for by the Subscribers, and was never omitted in Reports of kindred Societies—see the Reports of the Richmond Institution for Blind men; the London and Glasgow Institutions for the Blind, &c., &c.

In the Report of 1830, the name of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent appears as the Patroness of the Asylum, with two ladies of rank as Guardians, and also twenty-five Visiting Ladies. Compare the title page of this Report with the last Report. (See previous pages.) Mr. Armstrong, a Trustee, observed that the omission of the names of the Visiting Ladies *could be easily rectified next year*. We have no doubt, at this stage of the proceedings, he was quite ignorant of there really being no Visiting Ladies in existence; *he evidently supposed their names only had been omitted*. Dr. Bigger then pointed out that some of the life members named in the Report had died many years back; and he then asked the Trustees why the rules of the Asylum were not included; in fact, he requested to know if the Trustees had any rules to regulate the Asylum? Mr. Armstrong said "*he was not aware of any; he had never seen them.*" In short, it appeared that none of the Trustees knew of any rules or regulations, and then Dr. Bigger proceeded to speak of the balance sheet which appeared in the last Report—(see page 15).

He asked how it happened that the accounts were not Audited? Some of the Trustees said that it was unnecessary, for they all collectively were responsible for its accuracy—that the accounts had all been properly vouched, &c. Dr. Bigger drew their attention to the receipts. Some of the annuities were entered as a year and a-half, others for only half a year; and, without dwelling much on this inconsistency, he spoke of no credit being given for the rent of two houses in Bride-street, for which upwards of £40 had been received in 1829. (See accounts for 1829, 1855, p. 14 & 15.)

Dr. Bigger now entered on the disbursement side. The first item that called for explanation was the charge of £534 odd for maintenance, which, when added to that for washing, £26, amounted to the very large sum of £560 for the food and washing of about the same number of inmates as in 1829, when the expenses of food and washing was then only £295! very little more than half of what it cost this last year. He then read to the meeting the average cost of individual maintenance of the various Dublin institutions, and compared same with the cost of an inmate of the Molyneux, when the latter appeared excessively high.

MAINTENANCE AND WASHING.

The Matrons and servants are not included in the years 1827, 1828, and 1829, neither should they be included in 1855.

| Years | 1827. | 1828. | 1829. | 1855. |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Maintenance and Washing .. | £353 4 2 | £309 16 0 | £295 9 11 | £535 15 3* |
| Number of Inmates .. | 27 | 27 | 27 | 26 |
| Average cost each per annum | £13 7 2 | £11 9 6 | £10 18 10½ | £20 12 0 |

* £534 15s. 3d. for maintenance added to the washing, £26, amounts to £560 15s. 3d. Now there are three externs; one is paid £5, another about £12, and the other £8. Total, £25, which being deducted from the £560 15s. 3d., leaves £535 15s. 3d., as above stated, being the total cost of maintenance and washing last year.

The statement of the Committee says £16 19s. 10d.; the reason of this amount differing from ours is, that we do not include the two matrons and two servants, for matrons and servants are not included in striking the averages of other institutions.

RICHMOND BLIND INSTITUTION,

21 Men. Food £296 6 2½; average £14 2 2½

ST. PETER'S BOARDING SCHOOLS,

31 Boarders. Food £195 3 6; average £6 5 11

HOUSE OF REFUGE, BAGGOT-STREET,

30 Inmates. Food £226 18 3; average £7 11 3½

FREEMASON'S ORPHAN SCHOOL,

21 Girls. Food £164 19 4; average £7 17 1

LONDON BLIND ASYLUM,

57 Pupils. Food £762 19 6; average £13 7 8½

BLUE COAT HOSPITAL,

80 Boys. Food £386 9 3; average £4 16 7

All these institutions are far lower than the Molyneux. One of the Trustees, the Rev. Dr. Stanford, said that perhaps the inmates might be better fed in this Asylum. Now we knew quite well what food the poor women had, but we were anxious to see whether the Trustees knew it also. "Well," replied Dr. Bigger, "*perhaps the Trustees will inform us how the inmates of the Molyneux are dieted?*" And looking to Mr. Armstrong (a Trustee remember,) that gentleman said, "*he really did not know what the women had!*" He now turned to Mr. Moore, and this Trustee remarked, "*that being delicate women, of course they were obliged to give them very good food.*" We pressed this gentleman as to what good food he referred to, and he also confessed *he did not know*. We then applied to their Secretary, the Rev. C. M. Fleury, and he informed us they had "*meat.*" However, as we were anxious to know what food the women had each day, and as he knew no more about it than the Trustees, he went out of the Board-room, and brought in a large book, and proceeded to read the dietary given to the inmates.

Monday, Bread and Milk for dinner.

Tuesday, Broth.*

Wednesday, Cold Meat, (which had been boiled for hours in the broth the day before.)

Thursday, Boiled Salt Beef and Cabbage.

Friday, Salt Fish, Ling!

Saturday, Broth (as on Tuesday.)

Sunday, Cold Meat, (out of Broth, as on Wednesday.)

Potatoes are only given to the women twice a week. Only a few of the elder women have butter on their bread at breakfast and tea time.

Several gentlemen appeared exceedingly astonished at the very meagre dietary given to the poor blind women. It appeared that six of the oldest of the inmates, out of twenty-six, had a little roast meat *once a week*, we understand one leg of mutton a week! the cold meat out of the broth *forming two days' dinner* every week, and, above all, the *salt fish (Ling)* every Friday made all the gentlemen look at each other in astonishment. *Fish every Friday in a Protestant Institution.* Some knew not how to believe it.† A gentleman asked one of the Trustees whether any of the inmates were Roman Catholics? Oh, no, said he, but some one expressed an opinion that both the servants were Roman Catholics.

After this Dr. Bigger alluded to the great charge for clothing, being £79 13s. 1d. The same item in 1829 was £27 16s. 1d. The clothes were obtained from the establishment of one of the Trustees (Mr. Ferrier), and thus Mr. Harris, his clerk, had (as it

* There is a little mistake in the statement of the Committee as to Tuesday's dinner, Mr. Fleury did not read aloud anything about "*a leg of mutton.*" See what we afterwards have said about the "*mutton.*"

† This fish dinner has subsequently been changed to Thursday.

were) to pay himself out of the funds of the Asylum and accept his own receipt. This was virtually the case, although, perhaps, another clerk gave the receipt, *if any exists*. Mr. Harris said, "*there was nothing due for clothing the end of the previous year*," so that whatever made the item so very great, it was for articles supplied the last year. Throughout this discussion on the cost of the maintenance and clothing, the Trustees did not produce any accounts, or books of any kind, to explain or show how such items were made up. One would suppose they could easily have made matters satisfactory to the Subscribers who attended the meeting. How easily would doubts of the accuracy of the accounts have been dispelled if the Trustees had adopted an open and unreserved course. Could they not have laid on the table, or read out the list of items which formed the clothing to the amount of £79 13s. 1d? No; they never attempted to explain anything. In one stage of the proceedings, the Rev. Dr. Stanford expressed himself anxious to know and understand the management of the Asylum, for he said he was quite a stranger to it, and had been appointed a Trustee without his knowledge or consent.

| CLOTHING. | | 1827. | 1828. | 1829. | 1855. |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Total Amount .. | Years | £30 8 11 | £20 17 1 | £27 16 1 | £79 13 0 |
| Number Clothed .. | | 27 | 27 | 27 | 28* |
| Average cost each per annum | | £1 2 6½ | £0 15 5 | £1 0 7 | £2 16 10 |

* We have two externs here added to the twenty-six interns; the other extern, Kate Read, was not clothed by the Asylum.

Information subsequently obtained respecting the clothing, not known at the time of the meeting with the Trustees.

List of Articles of Clothing allowed to the inmates of the Molyneux Asylum, showing what they really had last year, 1855. Cost, as per last report, £2 16s. 10d. each individual.

| Clothing for each Inmate. | How often supplied. | Whether supplied last year. | Estimated Cost in 1855. | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----|----|
| | | | £ | s. | d. |
| 1 Cashmere Gown ... | every 2nd year. | none | | | |
| 1 Cloth Shawl ... | not for eight years | none | | | |
| 1 Common ditto ... | not for four years | none | | | |
| 1 Bonnet ... | every 2nd. year | none | | | |
| 1 Flannel Petticoat ... | every 2nd. year | none | | | |
| 1 Gingham Dress ... | ditto | supplied | - | 6 | 0 |
| 2 Aprons ... | ditto | supplied | - | 1 | 6 |
| 2 Pocket Handkerchiefs ... | ditto | supplied | - | 1 | 0 |
| 2 Towels ... | ditto | supplied | - | 1 | 0 |
| 2 Chemises, about every... | 1½ year | supplied | - | 2 | 0 |
| 2 Handkerchiefs ... | every year | supplied | - | 1 | 0 |
| 2 Pair of Shoes ... | every year | supplied | - | 8 | 0 |
| Articles supposed to be made in the Asylum. | | | £1 | 0 | 6 |

Materials for stays given every three years.

No hair-brushes, basins, nor wide tooth-combs provided at all:

It may appear strange that no hair-brushes, &c., are allowed, but the fact is that formerly the hair of the inmates was cut off close round their heads. This barbarous custom was changed, we believe, by the present Matron; in fact a small tooth-comb is all that is allowed. Hair-brushes, basins, &c., are obtained by the inmates by the kind assistance of their friends. It is but fair and right, in justice to the present Matron, to add that the clothing was of a very inferior quality before she came into the Asylum. The inmates only had very common and coarse stuff gowns, now they have Cashmere and neat gingham dresses; but it must be remembered that although this improvement has been made in the attire of the inmates yet the cost of female dress has been greatly diminished during the past years. We have given an estimate of the cost of the clothing for 1855, and it is distinctly remembered by several gentlemen that J. Harris, Mr. Ferrier's clerk, said there was no old account due to his employer at the commencement of 1855, (see last page); and we see by the unaudited balance-sheet, that a balance of £50 was left on the credit side at the end of the previous year (1854). [Page 15.]

If the items for the salary of the Matron and her assistant, porter, pew openers, organist, house servants, &c., had been given in detail, we should have seen how the extra £20 was expended. £139 8s. was the amount this past year, whereas, in 1829, these sums only amounted to £119 2s. 7d. As to mentioning the Organist, we scarcely think it to have been worth while, for Susannah Jenks, (one of the inmates,) we believe, receives only £2 per annum, a very small fraction indeed of £139.

Then follow the charge for Taxes, which Dr. Bigger said, we could not fathom, for no Taxes were charged or paid in 1829, whereas £22 14s. 4d. appeared in the last Report. On application at the office of the Collector-General, we found that Charitable Institutions were not liable to rates—at least, if they paid such, the amount would be refunded on application to the proper authorities. We also understood that the Landlord's portion, if paid by the officers of the charity, should in due time be deducted when paying the rent of the premises. We were informed that the following payments were received from the Molyneux Asylum during last year:—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|-----|----|----|
| 14th November, 1855, on Chapel—Landlord's Portions ... | 7 | 10 | 0* |
| Ditto House in Peter-street—Lilly ... | 6 | 18 | 0* |
| 13th February, 1855, Ditto Bramble ... | 3 | 3 | 0† |
| 8th March, 1856, Houses in Bride-street ... | 7 | 0 | 0‡ |
| | £24 | 11 | 0 |
| * Should be deducted from Rent, † and 10s. 1½d for half-} | | | |
| Poor Rates } | 14 | 18 | 1¼ |
| Amount still liable to a further deduction, | £9 | 13 | 1¼ |

No repayment could be yet claimed for the last item of £7,‡ as it was only cash paid on account; no receipt would be given until

the whole of the rates then due were paid, so we understood. How the Taxes could come to £22 14s. 4d. was inexplicable to us. The Trustees would not explain this subject. Dr. Bigger said, it would appear that the year before last must have been much more prosperous than 1855, a balance of £50 remaining on hand, whereas, after absorbing this balance, the Asylum left off at the end of the year with a debt of £203, so that in fact, the expenditure this past year had exceeded the receipts by upwards of £250. It would be most satisfactory to show what had been the Receipts and Expenditure of the year, 1854. However, as we have already observed, the Trustees sat and heard everything, but made no effort whatever at any explanation; and Dr. Bigger having closed his remarks, Mr. Allnutt produced a paper he had drawn up for the occasion, and commenced reading. But before we commence his statement we must introduce a new element in an advertisement that appeared in *Saunders' News-Letter*, respecting Mary Callaghan, whose case is fully spoken of in page 26, &c.

MOLYNEUX ASYLUM FOR BLIND FEMALES.

Peter-street, Dublin, May 27, 1856.

Average number of Inmates during past year :—Interns, 28. Externs, 3. Matron and Servants, 4. Total, 35.

Total cost of maintenance per last report, £534 15s. 3d. Average of individual maintenance, £15 5s. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

At the election held on April 15th, Ellen Devlin and Anne Burnett, having the highest number of votes, were admitted. Mary Callaghan, a poor persecuted convert, totally blind for the last six years, aged nineteen, was third on the poll, and lost admission by the retraction of one voter. She is now supported by the Rev. C. M. Fleury in an humble lodging, at the cost of 6s. per week, or rate of £15 12s. per annum.

A benevolent Gentleman, a friend to the Institution, has promised £50 in the hope that £150 more may be raised within two months to create a fund for her admission.

The above facts having been laid before the General Board of Trustees and Visiting Ladies this day (May 27, 1856),

It was Resolved—That while the Asylum can accommodate only thirty intern members, Mary Callaghan shall be admitted in the room of one of the externs, in the confidence that the said sum of £150 will be raised to meet the amount of a small stipend now paid to one of the externs, who has nearly recovered her full sight, and is partially able to support herself as an organist, for which she was educated in the Asylum.

CHARLES STUART STANFORD, Chairman.

It is necessary to give a copy of this Advertisement, as it is frequently referred to hereafter, and besides some of Mr. Fleury's friends asserted (at the time it appeared in *Saunders' News-Letter*), that it was a complete answer to Mr. Allnutt's first pamphlet, the little "*Address !*"

STATEMENT

Respecting the Molyneux Asylum read by Mr. Allnutt at the Meeting of Trustees and Friends of the Asylum, 11th July, 1856.

In the last Report, I do not find one word about externs,* but I find that the cost of maintenance and washing during the past year was £560, whereas, in 1829, it was £295; it is not correct to disunite the £26 for washing from the maintenance, for, in 1829, these items were included in the £295.

The number of inmates in 1829 was 27, and, in 1855, 28 (it now has transpired that there were only 26). The cost of individual maintenance, as stated in an Advertisement, which has appeared with respect to Mary Callaghan is not correct, for I know that one of the externs, who is organist at Clontarf, only receives £5 per annum, and another has half her maintenance paid by a lady; neither is it usual to include the Matron and servants when striking the average; but if we include them in 1855, we must do so in 1829. The cost of an inmate in 1829 was about £10 19s. per annum, and in the past year, counting two externs, in all 30 people, £18 13s., (truly £20 12s. each for 26 inmates, see pp. 19 & 46), amazingly high for inmates who have potatoes only twice a-week, and a diet table in other respects by no means generous.

The change complained of in the management of this Asylum has arisen during the last 25 years; the 10th Report is dated 1830, and that just issued was the 13th.

Comparing the Report of 1830 with that just issued, I observe that this Asylum is no longer under the protection of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent—which it was at that period—that it has now no Guardians in the room of Lady Lorton and Lady Molyneux, and that it has not one of the 25 Visiting Ladies, and, last of all, there appears no Work-mistress. This last official was a very important one. She was independent of the Matron, and,

* If nothing was said in the Trustees' Report of the Molyneux Asylum, how could Mr. Allnutt know at that time there were any externs? His "Address" was a *Review of the Trustees' Thirteenth Report*.

as employment is of great consequence to the inmates, they should not be deprived of the services of a Work-mistress. The present Assistant to the Matron does not fill that office, and if the Trustees inquire into her employment, they will find that her time is constantly occupied in making dresses and clothes for the Matron.

The Report of 1830 contains the accounts of three years. Even at that time, a departure was made from the original rule relating to the issuing a printed Report *every year*—for this should have been the 15th Report, the Asylum having been established for 15 years. It was, however, only the 10th Report. In the Report of 1830, a list of the Subscribers and their residences is given; does it not occur to the Trustees that they have no check on the Collector? I am not accusing this officer of any dishonesty, but I say that mistakes may arise from forgetfulness, and if a list of Subscribers was annually given every one could see for himself whether his subscription was included; in fact, in this 10th Report, and in reports of other institutions, inaccuracies, or omissions, are requested to be pointed out to the Secretary. There should be no difficulty in knowing all the voters; a list was offered to be made out for me for 5s. by the Assistant-Secretary, Mr. Evans. When I agreed to pay him this sum, a new difficulty was started—no election was taking place. Whether an election is occurring or not, a list of the voters should always be handed to any Subscriber who may ask for it, and that certainly without a charge of any kind.

A list of candidates is given in the 10th Report, and we find that five of their names appear in this year's list also. Some of the candidates have grown younger; Bridget Galise was 10 years of age in 1830, and is now only stated to be 30, instead of 36; not one of the five women have their age correctly stated. The list of candidates should not be given at random, No 29 in the last list is Elizabeth Scott, who was recommended by Miss Blackburne about nine years back; her admission was decided against at the time by the Trustees, as it appeared that her father was well able to support her, and yet her name still appears in the list every election. Why is it retained? This is only one out of many whose names it is quite useless to keep on the paper, unless, indeed, we want the public to believe there are so many more blind women anxious to gain admission than is the fact. At all events it shows how very carelessly these lists are drawn up.

I have now before me the Sermon preached on the open-

ing of the Institution, 19th November, 1815, and in the rules referred to is the following:—

There shall be an Annual Sermon preached on the 1st Sunday in May, when a printed Report shall be distributed of the proceedings of the past year, the number admitted into the Asylum, and a *detailed statement of the accounts*.

I also see that the house is capable of receiving 50 inmates,* besides affording apartments for the Chaplain, *who is required to reside in the house, and to engage in no other lucrative employment or situation whatever*. On a perusal of the Trust Deed, this, and other matters equally important, are clearly set forth, and the Trust Deed completely establishes the fact, that the Chapel is for the Asylum not the Asylum for the Chapel. Many of us have heard of late years that the Asylum is, as it were, of secondary importance. We must not forget the *original object* which was solely and entirely as *an Asylum for life for blind females above a certain age, and as a school for young females labouring under the loss of sight*. The Chapel is thus secondary and subordinate to the Asylum.

With respect to the election of inmates, it would, perhaps, be as well to give a slight outline of the late Election, as it, in a great degree, opened my eyes to the management of the Institution. When I first became interested for Anne Burnett, I wrote a note to the Rev. C. M. Fleury, the Secretary, to tell him what I was about to do. To that letter I received no reply. [Whatever other persons may say on the subject, I am far from being ashamed or afraid to say I feel great interest in these poor blind women, and I cannot understand the feelings of any person who may have attended the Molyneux Chapel year after year, and yet have never troubled themselves to visit the blind inmates.] In the course of a few weeks, in one of my visits to the Asylum, I went up stairs and saw an interesting little child, who had been ill a long while. This took place the winter before last—you doubtless must remember the great severity of that season—I was much surprised to find there was no fire in the large room in which poor little Mary Walsh lay. I wrote to Mr. Fleury on the subject, and said, if the Institution could not afford a fire I would pay for one during the period the little invalid was confined to her bed-room. This slight interference on my part brought down on me a very

* Mr. Fleury says, in the Advertisement, (page 23,) that the Asylum, "*can only accommodate thirty intern members*." It may be the case that the house is gradually shrinking as to its internal area, however it may appear to a beholder from the outside.

sharp and uncalled-for letter from Mr. Fleury, (page 6). He said it was considered unsafe to have a fire in the dormitories, forgetting that an iron guard would make it quite as safe there as in the work-room below stairs; and then he alluded, for the first time, to the canvass that was being carried on for Anne Burnett. I forgot to state that a vacancy had actually occurred, and, although in one part of Mr. Fleury's letter he said there was not going to be an election, yet, in another part he said the election would not take place until June (his letter was written in January, 1855). He called the parties who were interested in Burnett her ill-judging friends, and he stated that disinterested people were determined to neutralize all partiality and *jobbery*. I replied to this letter as it deserved; I repudiated any such words as *jobbery* being applied to our exertions. I saw clearly the whole drift of the matter—no one was to interfere in the elections; it could not be tolerated that any Subscriber should attempt to get a blind woman admitted; everything should be done by or through Mr. Fleury, the Chaplain. Although there was a vacancy, yet, as we had a great prospect of a majority of votes, it appeared that the only plan that could be devised to neutralize our efforts was to postpone the Election.

How different things appear at the present time; although there is no vacancy, still a candidate, for whom Mr. Fleury is interested, is at once put into the Asylum *without a vacancy or any regular election*. Without doubt, there should have been an election last year, and the friends of Anne Burnett have reason to believe that there was no election, because it was feared she would be elected. A lady was told by a gentleman, who is a great friend of the Chaplain, that she need not waste her time exerting herself for Anne Burnett, for the Trustees would not allow her to be admitted. We do not believe the Trustees ever determined any such thing, but it was evident others had decided it. Time passed; we had almost forgotten the subject, when suddenly, about the 3rd of April last, voting papers were issued for an election of two inmates on the 15th instant (poor little Mary Walsh, to whom I have alluded, died in the interim, so that there were now two vacancies). This appeared as though it was a plan to come upon us unprepared, and that the two candidates should be elected without our having time to do anything for Anne Burnett. I was not actually aware of the election until about the 8th, but I instantly sent out circulars, reminding parties of their promise to vote for Anne Burnett, and I soon found that applications had been made a fortnight at least before the 8th, that is, a week

or ten days *before the voting papers were printed*, and some of her friends, forgetful of their promise, or supposing an election had taken place last year, had recently promised to vote for Mary Callaghan. Notwithstanding this, they most kindly offered to do anything to recall their voting papers, and keep their promise towards Anne Burnett; [this they really had the kindness to do.]

Do the Trustees consider it proper that Mr. Fleury should send messages to persons, saying, "*that it was of no use voting for any excepting Callaghan and Devlin, as they were sure of being elected?*" A reverend gentleman himself told me that it would be of no use voting for Anne Burnett, as Mr. Fleury had informed him that Callaghan and Devlin would be elected. This gentleman votes for a lady on whose estate Burnett's father lives; who, of course, would be anxious to assist one of her own tenants. He was kind enough to fill up a new voting paper, and thus he kept his promise as respects Burnett. The Trustees cannot but see how injurious it is to the Institution that one individual—and that person the Chaplain of the Asylum—should strive to keep things entirely in his own hands, and to do only just as he pleases; *the freedom of election is totally destroyed*. Why should parties who desire to get a blind woman admitted, be compelled to place themselves under an obligation to the Chaplain of the Institution to get her elected? *If you desire the support of the public, the Elections should be open and free to all*. When the election came on, I attended with the Hon. King Harman, to whom Mr. Fleury was most uncivil, for when Mr. Harman was speaking of the publication of the accounts—Mr. Fleury said, "no one wants an account, master! The Trustees would not publish another account for five years, and if they even lost £10 by not publishing an annual Report, they did not care." And on Mr. Harman replying that, those who paid £10 might influence others who paid far more, Mr. Fleury, in a most rude and ungentlemanly manner, said, "*let us stop this foolish conversation*."

The Election was conducted in the most irregular manner; no Chairman was appointed; towards the close of the poll, Mr. Fleury, the Secretary, pulled out of his pocket a bundle of voting papers, signed by the parties *in blank*, which he proceeded very leisurely to fill up one by one for Callaghan. Is this a proper course? If parties are so indifferent and trouble themselves so little as not to fill up the voting papers, the Secretary* surely has no right to do it himself. Would such an act be allowed in other institutions? Notwithstanding these,

* The Rev. C. M. Fleury is Chaplain as well as Secretary.

and other efforts, which I have not time to mention, Anne Burnett was elected by a majority of 19 votes. Even then some doubts were expressed by Mr. Fleury as to her being eligible. Devlin and Callaghan's certificates were all prepared, and lying on the table; however, after a few words, a tacit admission was made that she was elected.

Now I come to the movement for Mary Callaghan. The Annual Sermon was preached, and towards the close of it a very unusual and strong appeal was made in her behalf, as if there had never hitherto been an unsuccessful candidate; to make the appeal more powerful, it was asserted that Mr. Fleury himself was supporting Callaghan. Bear in mind that the Institution was £200 in debt at this time, and *two candidates had already been elected*; but still Callaghan had not been successful. Some one is said to have offered £50 if £150 more could be collected; I, therefore, presume the Trustees must have agreed to admit Callaghan for £200. A meeting of the Trustees is then held, and a few ladies are requested to attend, who are dubbed for the occasion "Visiting Ladies," and next day an announcement appears in *Saunders' News-Letter*, that the meeting agreed to admit Callaghan, in the hope that £150 would be collected in two months (it has not been done, but still Callaghan is here). A Trustee, who is a clergyman of influence, is put forward as chairman (Dr. Stanford). We believe this gentleman was greatly deceived.* If my exertions were called *jobbery*, what shall we call this method of getting Callaghan admitted? I say it was gross jobbery to take in any candidate on the bare hope of collecting £150; and it was the greatest injustice towards all the other forty candidates, who had been trying for years to enter the Asylum.

How were the ladies called together? The Visiting Ladies had not met for a period of about nine years. A lady residing in the suburbs of Dublin, one of the Visiting Ladies about nine years back, received a printed circular by post the *morning of the meeting*; another lady received a circular the *evening before*. These printed circulars were so ancient that *they did not bear the name of the present Secretary*,† but that of Edward Marks. *One of these circulars had a postscript added by the Secretary*, and the other had not. Neither of these ladies attended, for they justly considered if the Trustees wished them to resume their duties, after a lapse of *nine years*, they would have requested their Secretary to state such wish; and should not the ladies have had *some days notice* of the intended meeting, and

* We cannot say this now.

† C. M. Fleury.

should not the object have been clearly communicated to all of them? These so-styled Visiting Ladies were only called together to give some colour to the proceedings; they did not visit the Asylum to see how the inmates were fed, nor did they attempt to look to the domestic economy of the Institution. Does it not strike the mind of any friend to the Asylum, that, while the expenditure largely exceeds the income, it is highly improper that Mr. Fleury and the Assistant-Secretary should be collecting funds not to clear this debt, but that Mary Callaghan may remain in the Asylum without being properly elected, contrary to all the rules of the Institution? In the name of everything fair and honorable go through the form, at least, of a regular election. I have promised to vote for Mary Callaghan; I have not one word to speak against the poor blind woman herself,* but I justly complain of the very unusual and irregular manner in which she is thrust into the Asylum by those who should, above all others, be the last to break the rules of the place. The late Lord Lorton wished the Trustees to admit a blind girl, whose eyes had been picked out by a common fowl, and his lordship offered to pay a certain sum. The Trustees at the time very properly declined his proposal, but the girl was afterwards regularly elected.

To turn especially towards the management of the Asylum. The Trust Deed provides that three Trustees shall form a quorum, and that they shall meet *at least every three months*. Can the Trustees say this has been done? If they had such difficulty in collecting their body together to meet us, it appears doubtful whether they could get a quorum to meet every quarter; but even if they could, surely four meetings a year would never enable them to do their duty faithfully to the Asylum. If a Managing Committee were formed of twelve or fifteen gentlemen, they should meet regularly every fortnight, any of the Trustees could attend their meeting whenever they thought proper, and, of course, take the chair, and have full access to the books of the Committee.

The Trust Deed also provides, that one of the Trustees shall act as Sub-Treasurer, and keep an account of the collections. Has this been done? Certainly not. *The collections are handed over to the Matron Sunday after Sunday*, and she gives an account only *quarterly*, not to one of the Trustees, but to *Mr. Harris*, a clerk to one of the Trustees.

The Trust Deed also distinctly declares that the Chaplain “*shall not use or exercise any other lucrative situation, profession,*

* Miss Jackson, one of the present Visiting Ladies, can, perhaps, testify to the truth of this.

or employment whatsoever." Now, we all know that the Rev. C. M. Fluery is the proprietor or principal of a large boys' school, and yet he says in his letter, "*that the Trustees are very thoughtful men, and regulated by a Trust Deed in all things!*" (see page 6). Why the Trustees, in many respects, have acted totally at variance with the provisions of the Deed.

I understand that both the servants are Roman Catholics. The cook entered as a Protestant, but I believe her niece has said she is a Roman Catholic. I ask the Trustees whether Protestants cannot be obtained? I also beg to bring under their notice that the Matron is continually absent from her post. Miss Hines generally leaves the Asylum every Tuesday after the Lecture, and does not return until Thursday morning. If she returns on Wednesday she takes a holiday on Saturday. It may be said in truth that she is absent two days in every week, and frequently more. It is a question the Trustees should closely examine as to how the inmates are attended to when the Matron is so constantly away from the Asylum. I am frequently there, and I may safely assert that she is out four times out of five * Dr. Bigger has spoken of the food, and I cannot but add that I was certainly much astonished when first I heard of the very poor diet given to these blind inmates. What can be the meaning of *salt ling* every Friday—why fish always on a Friday? Really the Trustees would do well to inform us if this is a Protestant or Roman Catholic Institution. Salt meat should not always be given to the inmates every week—why are potatoes only supplied twice a-week? After the inmates have pleased us by the melody of their voices on a Sunday, they (poor things !) are set down to a miserable dinner—a little bit of cold meat—out of which broth had been made for the Saturday's dinner. Why, if the broth was good for anything, the meat was boiled to rags. They do not even get a potatoe. *The potatoes are only purchased just as they are required, in small quantities.* Should not a proper supply of potatoes and every other thing be contracted for?

The Molyneux Asylum should be conducted as other institutions at Belfast, Glasgow, Liverpool, and London. Can you point to one without a Managing Committee? If you have fifteen or twenty Visiting Ladies who are permitted and encouraged to do their duty, each lady will have a direct interest in the sup-

* Mr. and Miss Allnutt were spending the evening on one occasion with the Rev. H. V. White and Mrs. White, at the Molyneux, and Mr. Allnutt took his violin down to the work-room and played a few Hymns to the inmates *while they sang*—some of them wished him to play other airs also, but most fortunately he did not; what a handle would now have been made of such an occurrence, had he done so.

port and well being of the Asylum. This also will be the case with the Managing Committee. If these gentlemen are properly chosen, and will not fear to do their duty, they will not only endeavour to economise the funds, but they will each and all be to some extent collectors, and the existence of these bodies will give the public confidence that the funds are made the most of.

It is quite impossible to close this statement without alluding to the conduct of the present Matron. It is said on all sides that her behaviour is most uncourteous and repulsive to every one who visits the Institution, as though she was patronizing them by allowing them to see the place. Ladies of great influence have declared her behaviour unbearable.

I could bring forward several matters of this kind, but I have more weighty things to say. Would the Trustees have the goodness to direct Miss Hines to produce her book of incidental expenses? I do not doubt that the *tots* in this book are correct (Mr. Harris has taken care of this), but let me for a few minutes look over it, and I put it to the Trustees whether they would allow a week or two of entries to be read before all the women? I should like to know about the bread given to the servants. I have also to remark that the Trustees should take immediate steps to inquire into the truth of various reports, which, if true, are of themselves quite sufficient to undermine and ruin any Institution. The Trustees are bound instantly to inquire into the subject, painful as it is, and it accounts for the very great dislike of having any Visiting Ladies to attend the Asylum.

It is a fact that these poor blind women are afraid of a similar catastrophe as that which occurred at Strabane a short time back—they are continually in dread of being burned in their beds—and is such an event impossible? I am alluding to a report that the Matron is constantly in the habit of exceeding the bounds of moderation in drink, and I pray the Trustees to go and ask all the women if this is true.

The Assistant-Matron always goes out from seven to ten o'clock every evening when the Matron is at home, and on her return the Matron is in bed.—(See her evidence, p. 37.)

I ask the Trustees to have Margaret Ring before them, and examine her as well as the blind women. Say not that she will assert that which is not true—she is well known to various respectable persons, and I have the best of characters for truthfulness, &c., from her present mistress, and the Trustees cannot refuse to hear her evidence. A bottle of wine is had from Mr. Faulkner, the grocer, in Grafton-street, every Satur-

day. Ask the inmates whether any of them have had it—of course at times they are ordered a little—but every week this bottle is brought into the Asylum. I will add no more, though indeed there are still numerous matters yet untouched. Let the Trustees do their duty, and things can be remedied for the future; but matters have come to that pass that it is impossible longer to keep them secret.

The reading of the preceding paper was frequently interrupted by the Trustees, they declared they did not come there to hear anything personal. When Mr. Allnutt had concluded, and his witnesses being at hand to substantiate the charges, there arose a warm discussion—it was urged that it was unfair to expect such charges to be met without due notice; and on the other hand, it was contended if the inquiry was postponed, it would leave room for undue influence to be exerted on the Blind Inmates of the Asylum, who, Mr. Allnutt insisted, ought to be examined on the subject. It was said that, if delayed, an opportunity of tampering with the witnesses would be given; and as it appeared that Mr. Armstrong, one of the most active of the Trustees, was compelled to leave Dublin on professional business, and could not return for about a month, it was urged that the case ought to be proceeded with at once. Even Mr. Allnutt's first witness was called into the room, but it was eventually determined to postpone the investigation to the 6th of August. Mr. John Robinson (the solicitor) strongly recommended the appointment of a Managing Committee, a course which had the Trustees then adopted would probably have averted the exposure they have now brought upon themselves; but Mr. Robinson's suggestion, as well as that of every real friend of the Asylum—from the issue of Mr. Allnutt's "*Address*" down to the recommendation of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin—we repeat, the advice and good offices of every real friend has been refused and repelled by the Trustees, who scorn the least interference; in fact, Mr. Moore, one of the Trustees, was heard to say "*what right had strangers to interfere.*" We ask who could be greater strangers to the affairs of the Institution than the Trustees themselves, and Mr. Moore, in particular, who had not spoken to the inmates for twelve years? [see page 53]. The Trustees as good as say, *why should the public impertinently require an account of their subscriptions?* Is it not very kind of the Trustees to allow their names to be used, should they not be permitted to disburse the funds without any questions being put to them on the subject? Quite recently we have

been informed, on good authority, that when a lady expressed to a certain individual, she wished that last year's published accounts at least should be audited. "*Why*," said he — "*it would be just as reasonable to ask for the accounts of a private family!*" The management of the Molyneux Asylum assuredly is rather too much of a private affair. We plainly tell the Trustees so, and either they must submit to have the accounts properly *audited and printed every year*; or they must resign, and thus make room for others to manage the Institution, who will not be afraid to act openly and above board. True, the Trustees say, (and their Chaplain echoes the opinion), that those who do not approve of the present way of managing the Asylum can cease to subscribe to its funds. We say, *what right has any public Institution to confine its privileges merely to such as are willing to "SUBMIT" to its abuses?*

In due time the 6th August arrived, and Mr. Allnutt and his witnesses attended at 12 o'clock. The following Gentlemen also composed the meeting:—Mr. William Armstrong, Mr. Moore, Mr. L. Bickerstaff, Rev. Dr. Stanford, Mr. Watson, (these five are Trustees,) the Rev. C. M. Fleury, Chaplain of the Asylum; also the Hon. King Harman, Mr. Grogan, M.P., Mr. Aylmer, Mr. W. Caldbeck, Mr. F. Sutton, Mr. Pollock, Dr. Bigger, Mr. John Hogan, Mr. George Cathcart, Mr. White (the Barrister), Mr. Belas, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Harris, and others may have attended, whose names we did not take down. Mr. Armstrong, who took the chair, immediately called on Mr. Allnutt to proceed with his charges; and his witnesses not being quite ready, he left the Board-room for them. In the mean time Dr. Bigger addressed the Chairman, and said, he requested the Trustees would inform him whether they gave Mr. Harris authority to write him the note to postpone the first meeting on the 11th July to the following week, Mr. Harris saying, "*it was unavoidably postponed to an early day next week!*" (see copy of his letter in page 13)—when it was quite clear, had we not met the Trustees on that day, we could not have met them again for about a month, viz.:—until this day, the 6th of August. Mr. Armstrong and all the Trustees declared they gave Mr. Harris no authority whatever to postpone the meeting, or to write the letter; they knew nothing whatever about it. Mr. Harris was present during this scene, and could not say one word in justification of his having written the letter, neither did he inform the meeting, who instigated him to send the letter to Dr. Bigger.

Mr. Allnutt now entered the room with Margaret Ring, and the Trustees, having sent for the Matron the examination commenced by Mr. Armstrong, the Chairman, questioning the witness. Mr. Allnutt and Mr. White (the latter said he attended merely as a friend of the Matron) also examined Margaret Ring. We now proceed to give her evidence. We desire to give the evidence truly, and we appeal to those Gentlemen who attended whether the statement we are now giving does not strictly agree with what took place at the meetings. It may here be said that an application has been made to Mr. Armstrong for a copy of his notes, but he declined to furnish such to the Committee. See page 21 of the Committee's "*Statement*."

Margaret Ring lived as Assistant Matron in the Molyneux Asylum for above three years, from December, 1850, to February, 1854; the cause of her leaving the Asylum was that one day she complained to the Matron, when in the room with the inmates; of the constant interruptions she suffered in reading to the girls, by being compelled to get up and open the street door; she asked why the housemaid could not attend the door? The Matron was offended that she spoke before the inmates, and said, "why could you not speak to me when alone?" when she replied, "why, if I did it would be of no use." The following day the Matron gave her a note, saying she was to leave the Asylum. She had a discharge given her, which she produced to the meeting, and of which the following is a correct copy:—

"Molyneux Asylum, February 13, 1854.

"Margaret Ring has lived with me as Assistant in the management of this Institution for three years, during which period she conducted herself with strict integrity and faithfulness; she discharged all the duties of the situation in a trust-worthy and industrious manner. I regret to part her.

34, *Peter-street*.

(Signed), ELIZABETH HINES."

Margaret Ring lived with Mrs. Crofton, 76, Euston-terrace, Ranelagh-road, before she came to this Asylum, and the following is a copy of her discharge from that lady:—

"27, Upper Lesson-street, 21st November, 1850.

"Margaret Ring lived with me for four years (and two years previous to my joining the family), as Parlour and Housemaid, during which period she conducted herself with the strictest honesty, sobriety, and quietness. I consider her a person in whom every dependence may be placed on account of her never deviating from the truth; she understands the care of plate, &c., and attends very well at table. She also solely waited on my mother-in-law, an aged lady, to whom she was most careful and attentive. I part her now with much regret, first paying all wages due.

M. CROFTON."

She was then living a housemaid in the family of ———, of Merriion-square, North. The Matron nearly always left the Asylum on Tuesday after the lecture, and returned on Thursday. If she occasionally came back earlier, she generally went out on Saturday for the day. She almost invariably was absent two days every week, and frequently oftener than this. She remembers the death of Jane Byrne, in fact she died in her arms—the Matron was absent that night; she has frequently seen the Matron the worse of drink; she could make no mistake, she was constantly in this state of an evening, so that often she could

not be understood ; she (Margaret Ring) did not name it to any one, she could not speak to any Visiting-Ladies, for there were none during the period she was at the Asylum. Some few young ladies came to read to the inmates between the hours of twelve o'clock and two o'clock in the day, *but they were not Visiting-Ladies ; they had no power to interfere*, neither had they Committee meetings, nor did they attend at meal times, or look to the clothing of the inmates. She had occasion to see the Matron one evening in her bedroom, and on going up stairs for that purpose, she was met by Alicia Green, the housemaid, and Mary Tremble, who prevented her going into the Matron's bedroom. A bottle of port wine was always brought to the Asylum every Saturday from Mr. Faulkner, the grocer—this is not the wine used in the Chapel, which is obtained quite from another Wine Merchant, and kept in the vestry. On being questioned about the Accounts, and on Mr. Alhutt requiring the book of Incidental Expenses, it was produced ; Margaret Ring instantly pointed out the item of 1s. 10d. or 1s. 8d. as for Bread entered each Monday, immediately after the payment of 2s. 6d. to each of the servants for Breakfast money. She said, it was part of her duty to hand the servants their bread from that supplied to the house by the baker, who attended three times a week from Chapelizod. She had seen the Matron write down this very item of Bread, although such was not purchased by the Matron, but taken out of the regular supply to the Asylum. Most of the charges in the book were over-charges, that for instance, the Buttermilk was set down as having cost 9d. or 6d., whereas it really cost only about 3d. Alicia Green, the housemaid, first drew her attention to these entries. Alicia Green is a Roman Catholic, and also the cook, although she calls herself a Protestant. She has known the cook to be also intoxicated. She knew that Mary Tremble (one of the inmates) was treated by the Matron quite differently from any of the other women. She had her tea and meals often with, or immediately after the Matron, or in the pantry away from the other inmates ; and Mary Tremble gave out the tea for the inmates to the cook. Mr. Fleury, the Chaplain, often came to the Asylum, *but not to the inmates*, whilst she was at the place.

Kate Read was elected an inmate of this Asylum, when about ten years of age—was now organist at Clontarf Church. Her sight was scarcely any better now than when she was in the Molyneux ; it was always better when she was in good health, but became very indifferent when she was ill. She was compelled to leave the Asylum about five years ago ; she was absent on a visit to her friends in the North ; and she received a letter from the Rev. C. M. Fleury, stating the Trustees did not wish her to return ; she did not feel satisfied, and she immediately returned to Dublin, and went to the Asylum. She saw Mr. Fleury *once*, who told her she must leave the place ; she asked him to let her see the Trustees ; and he replied, “she could not see any of the Trustees ; only saw Mr. Fleury, as well as she recollects on one occasion. *There were no Visiting-Ladies* to whom she could speak ; she did not see the Matron, who was unwell, but she saw *Mr. Harris* about four times. He insisted on her going, and said, *if she did not go quietly, and at once force would be used to make her quit the Asylum*. When she said, “*where shall I go ?*” Mr. Harris replied that “*the Trustees did not care where she went to !*” After she left, some of the congregation interfered, and caused the Trustees to permit her to attend the Asylum about three times a week, and take music lessons from Susannah Jenks, the chief organist, for about two years. From the exertions of the friends before alluded to, the Trustees also allowed her five pounds a year, payable quarterly, by the Matron—she never gave her any receipt for these payments. She was very kind to her, but with great sorrow she must tell the truth, and say she has frequently seen the Matron under the influence of drink.

We beg to add a few words on this poor girl's case, we believe it was an act of "*jobbery*" (Mr. Fleury's word) getting her into the Molyneux, for it could not be considered she was blind; but surely after she had been kept there from childhood, from ten to twenty years of age, it was cruel and heartless in the extreme of the Trustees to turn her out into the world. What would become of her had it not pleased God to raise up friends? We cannot understand why Mr. Harris should appear in the business. Who deposes him to interfere, and who told Mr. Harris to write the letter putting off the meeting of the 11th July? The Trustees say, they did not.

Our readers will learn, we think, with feelings of indignation, that since this enquiry Kate Read's little annual stipend of £5, has been taken from her. She had a letter from *the Matron* to tell her she will not be allowed to visit the inmates for the future; and that the Trustees will no longer continue the payment of £1 5s. a quarter, and yet in the advertisement about Mary Callaghan, [see page 23] the Trustees say, they are collecting funds to make permanent provision for this extern, to enable them to take in Mary Callaghan. So bitter is the feeling against this poor girl, Kate Read, that even the Sexton, Lilly, left his duty of opening the pews one Tuesday, and actually sat up in the gallery by her side, to prevent her speaking to any of her former companions and friends, the inmates of the Asylum. To proceed—on the withdrawal of Kate Read, who was much affected during her examination, the present Assistant Matron was called into the room:—

Maria Franklin was Assistant Matron in the room of Margaret Ring, the first witness; had been in the situation about two and a half-years. She is always allowed by the Matron to go home and see her friends of an evening at about seven o'clock, *when the Matron is at the Asylum*; and she does not return until about ten o'clock at night, *when the Matron has retired to bed*. This arrangement was not made at her request, but the Matron told her she might go, and, of course, she was happy to see her friends. [*Maria Franklin* evidently was not at all at ease; she hesitated, and did not answer promptly in a clear and decided manner.] She admitted that the Matron continually left the Asylum; that she went on Tuesday and returned on Thursday or Friday. When asked whether she had noticed any appearance of drink, she hesitated, and remarked "*why you know, Sir, I am always out of an evening when the Matron is at home.*" When pressed for a more decided reply, she said, "*she had seen something.*" She really could hardly say what it was, but it was something strange, it might have been drink. Mary Tremble did not have her meals with the other women; she also gave out the tea to the Cook. Mr. Fleury did not attend the inmates, but was with the Matron often. The girls sometimes complained of their dinner; and she had told the Matron of it. She cut the bread on Saturday for the use of the women on Sunday; she covered the pieces over with some clothes. One of the

gentlemen, Mr. W. Calbeck said, it was "*quite right and proper ; she was a good girl for not cutting the bread on a Sunday.*" Other gentlemen differed from him entirely, and considered it a great unkindness to cut bread the day before it was required to be eaten, especially in the summer time.*

We have been informed that when one of the inmates complained of this circumstance, the reply she got was, "*Oh you will eat all the less of it then !*" It is a similar discomfort to that of the work-room, the only room having a fire for the warmth of the blind inmates, is given up to the Sunday School for the children of the members of the congregation. Whilst the women—some of them of advanced age—are to stand or sit in the cold bedrooms, or anywhere else they please, without a fire—formerly the Sunday School was carried on in the Chapel, which is warmed. It shows that the comfort of these poor blind women is of very little, or no consideration.

Strange to say the inmates are not allowed to join the Sunday School. We know what Mr. Fleury said on this subject.

Surely, some plan could be adopted to render a fire as safe in the largest bed-room as in the work-room. The inmates not only have no fire to warm them before attending the church service at twelve o'clock, but when they leave the chapel, they sit down to about as miserable and comfortless a dinner as any one can imagine—a lump of hard cold beef, boiled for hours the previous day for the soup, with a piece of dry bread, cut the previous day, *without a potatoe*. This at an expense of upwards of £20 each per annum. Such treatment is *almost beyond belief* ; and it makes one feel most indignant, that any set of men can be found to defend such unfeeling conduct. Maria Franklin proceeded to say, that she was often employed making dresses for the matron. At the same time, we are given to understand that the work for the inmates garments is frequently given out. One would say *that should be done before the matron's dresses were made in the place*. Lilly, the sexton, sometimes had meat and drink in the place. We know a good deal of this eating and drinking at the expense of the Asylum, but we spared the witness, and she was questioned no more on this subject ; she seemed to be at a loss to know what course to steer—she did not want to betray her mistress, knowing full well that she could be sent out of the Asylum at a moment's notice, (which was actually the case a few days after,) Maria Franklin had been made to sign a paper before her engagement to the effect that she would leave at once, whenever required so to do. Poor Maria ; she had said quite

* Doubtless Mr. W. Calbeck always has his Sunday's bread cut on Saturday !

enough to settle her, although but little to bring home the charges, and in due course she was told to go by the Matron one Saturday evening, without the least reason given to her. She insisted on staying until Monday morning, and as the Matron would only pay her the wages due to that exact time, she summoned her before the Lord Mayor for a quarter's wages. The undertaking was produced, but his Lordship still felt inclined to give her the quarter's wages, until he was informed the Charity would have to pay the amount, when he dismissed the complaint. We are happy to add, that Maria Franklin has obtained a more respectable place, where we hope she will remain many years. She has since met Mr. Allnutt at the Crystal Palace in London, and on his speaking to her respecting her evidence, she said, "*surely the gentlemen must have seen that I wished to save my Mistress.*"

We will not be answerable for the truth of the result of the summons before the Lord Mayor. We only give the information we obtained from others.

Mr. Allnutt now called on the Trustees to examine the blind inmates. Some of the Trustees declared that it was a most improper course; that it would injure the Institution, and so forth. Mr. Armstrong, the chairman, declared that if Mr. Allnutt demanded it, they must be heard. Then the question arose how were they to be examined? Mr. Allnutt wished the Trustees to go into the work-room, and ask the women in a body if the charges, (especially that of drinking), are true. This, it was considered, could not be done. Then he was requested to name the women he wished to have examined, which he positively declined; and then he suggested that the inmates should be brought into the room one by one. Subsequently it was arranged that they should be called in according to the period they had been in the Asylum, and Mr. Bickerstaff (a Trustee), brought them into the room as their names stood on the list. After the examination of each was concluded, the witness was taken into another room, to avoid, as much as possible, their telling each other what they were asked or said on the subject.

We now proceed to give the examination of these poor blind women on this painful subject:—

EXAMINATION OF THE BLIND INMATES.

Before we proceed to give the evidence we must remark that this day we were not so careful to note down everything as on the following day, and we wish it to be borne in mind that no lawyer questioned the witnesses on our side. Mr. White, a barrister, appeared very much interested for the other party. With these prefatory remarks we shall commence.

1. *Mary Mc'Donnell* on being led into the room by one of the Trustees sat down. She had been forty years in the Asylum; had noticed something wrong about the Matron—a thickness of voice in reading of an evening—never noticed anything of the kind in the morning. Cannot account for a bottle of wine being sent to the Asylum regularly every week; the women do not get it; sometimes when they are ill they are ordered a little wine, but they are not always ill.

2. *Susannah Jenks*, the chief Organist, has been thirty-five years in the Asylum; she frequently noticed something about the Matron; could not tell any particular day. Drunk was a hard word to say; knew it by the Matron's voice. Does not remember the number of times; noticed it chiefly by the voice; the first time by the manner of reading.

3. *Margaret Roberts*, thirty-five years in the Asylum. [This witness was most anxious to know who was in the room, whether the Trustees were present. Indeed it may be said that most of the inmates appeared anxious on this point. Margaret Roberts spoke of Mr. Ferrier most kindly, but she seemed oppressed with some thing, not being able to understand why he had resigned] After showing some reluctance in speaking she said never knew the Matron to be *entirely* intoxicated, but there was more than what was right or should be; [her exact words] she never reckoned the times—not early in the day—it would be in the evenings; she had prayed for her for years.

4. *Mary Tremble*, thirty years in the Institution; dines and takes her meals in the pantry away from the other women; the Matron allows her so to take her meals; she never knew her to be drunk; never knew any thickness of speech; she never prevented Margaret Ring from seeing the Matron; she suffered very much from Margaret Ring; she heard her say on leaving the Asylum that she (Margaret Ring) would seek revenge of the Matron. [This witness was examined by Mr. White, the barrister, on the part of Miss Hines; and when Mr. Allnutt cross questioned her she could not explain how Margaret Ring made her suffer. On being asked whether she knew the gentleman who first examined her, (Mr. White,) *she said she did not*; after a while she said *she thought she did*, and on being further pressed, *she of her own accord gave out his name, and admitted Mr. White had questioned her on the previous Friday.*]

5. *Martha Bidwell*, thirty years an inmate; [spoke of the truth of the charges against the Matron as follows] had observed it in reading; never in the morning; no thickness of voice in the morning. One evening she staggered against the door, and did not stop to finish the reading; supposed it was drink; she smelt the wine through the house of an evening. Mary Tremble [see the previous witness, No. 4] was displeased with Margaret Ring, the late assistant Matron, because Margaret Ring would not let Mary Tremble have the *key of the pantry*.

6. *Catherine Maguire*, thirty-two years an inmate; had observed the Matron under the influence of drink; often for the last eight years by the hoarseness of her voice, which otherwise is good, clear, and distinct. She entertained a feeling of pity towards the Matron, had prayed to the Lord about it. [This witness is supposed to have asserted that she had to drag the Matron up stairs to bed with the assistance of four other women, but Catherine Maguire asserts she said no such thing, but that she and four others—Anne M'Goey, Mary Mason, Eliza O'Brien, and Ellen Whitley—*heard* such. The omission of the word *heard* would of course alter the case very much; and it should be borne in mind that during the examination the women were in a state of trepidation, many of them shed tears, and appeared very unwilling to give evidence; they constantly inquired whether the Trustees were present, as much as to say that it would be of no use and even dangerous for them to speak of their treatment to those who had no power to help them. On another occasion she said she *heard* (her own words this time) a rush on the stairs, and she heard Mary Tremble say to the Matron, "hold tight, dear." The cook has been drunk, and one time fell down stairs.

7. *Bridget Murphy*, thirty years. The Matron was very kind to her; never knew anything wrong about her; never knew her under the influence of drink.

8. *Ellen Whitley*, an inmate twenty-three years, on being asked if the charge was true, she said—Yes, knew the Matron to be dragged up stairs to bed by Mary Tremble.

9. *Jane Scott*, an inmate twenty-two years—knew the Matron to be in the habit of drinking for the last seven years by the thickness of her voice. She has known several times she could not go up stairs without assistance; she knew this herself; she would not say anything on hearsay; she was afraid to mention it; *Mary Tremble used to take care of the Matron at such times*. [Further examination of the Inmates adjourned to the following day, at half-past eleven o'clock in the forenoon.]

Thursday, August 7th, Examination of Inmates continued.

10. *Eliza Nelson*, twenty-three years an inmate, had observed the Matron under the influence of drink for the last two or three years by the thickness of her voice of evenings. Often goes into the country; she (*Eliza Nelson*) was away this time last year for four months in the county of Cavan; her friends always pay the expenses of her journey; had often spoken to others of the thickness of the Matron's voice; lately did not like to speak of it, or to condemn her, "for," she added, "we are all fellow sinners, and it is hard to speak of the sins of others."

11. *Margaret M'Donnell*, twenty-three years an inmate; she was sorry to have to say she did observe the Matron under the influence of drink; she also complained of the Matron neglecting her; she was often ill with a sore throat; she could take no food for a long time, the Matron might have given her something, but never did; she had often been unwell, and the Matron was not kind to her. She knew the state of the Matron by the thickness of her voice and the deadness of her hand; observed it often for about seven or eight years past. She was once going up to bed when Mary Tremble was helping the Matron to bed, it was in summer time; never spoke of it until it was becoming public. *Mary Tremble has the key of the pantry, and can do what she likes with the contents*. She does not consider Bridget Murphy [No. 7] so sharp as she should be. Bridget is no knitter, cannot knit a stocking, but can only do a plain garter. In answer to some question put by Mr. White, she said a lady said lately to them—"Well, girls, what dinners do you get, I hope you will soon be better off" Miss P. was the lady. This occurred about three or four weeks back. She was on the stairs once when Mary Tremble was with the Matron; Mary went up every night; *the inmates were never visited by Rev. C. M. Fleury, the Chaplain*.

12. *Mary M'Goey*, twenty years an inmate; she knew that the Matron drank; knew it by the thickness of her voice. She often smelt wine on her and through the house; observed it nearly eight years back, very often. Never heard the Matron carried up to bed; she had spoken of it to some few of the girls two or three years back; spoke of it to her sister. *Mary Tremble has the keys of the pantry*. The Matron goes out on Tuesday and returns on Thursday, and sometimes oftener. The inmates receive no visits from Mr. Fleury. She thought when one girl (Mary Tremble) was examined on Friday last, she might. At the last meeting they heard that some charges were brought against the Matron. The Matron told the Assistant Matron, she (Margaret M'Goey) heard from one of the inmates that there was a charge of seven years' drinking and sleeping out of nights; could not tell which girl, would not like to mention names. They said they knew the Lord would bring the matter to light. Thickness of voice in the afternoon, and when going for directions about work; understood the Matron but badly. They had noticed it for a long time before they spoke of it. *Only three of the inmates could play the organ*.

13. *Anne M'Goey*—Has been an inmate for twenty years; has observed something wrong about the Matron; was afraid she took too much drink, observed it by her voice. She was assisted up stairs about two years back; she heard her assisted up stairs by Mary Tremble about June. She also knew her once to be assisted out of the bed-room where she (Anne M'Goey) sleeps; she could not remember the month, but remembers it distinctly between the hours of ten and eleven o'clock at night. The Matron had been in her (Anne M'Goey's) room to see a girl in delicate health (Letitia Lawless), Alicia Green, the house-maid, was present, and helped the Matron out; they have talked of it very much lately since the first meeting; we heard Mary Tremble leave the Matron in her bedroom, and then she went down stairs for the house-maid, who went up. The house-maid is a Roman Catholic. The Matron leaves the Asylum on Tuesday, and returns generally on Thursday. She (Anne M'Goey) used to play the organ, but was obliged to cease practising; *there was no time*, for Mr. Fleury's two sons were continually playing. She complained to Mr. Ferrier, one of the Trustees, and he referred her to Mr. Fleury, who said he would have a Board.* It was Mr. Charles Fleury and Mr. Francis who played; one had also played the organ for the Church service once.† They have spoken frequently of this matter of the Matron, and although they would be sorry, still they would answer any questions put to them. They heard there were two charges—drinking and living out of the house. In answer to some questions, Anne M'Goey stated the following remarkable occurrence:—Remembers a blind man being constantly in the house about two or three years back; we heard that Mr. Fleury sent him; he used to come every day about eleven o'clock in the morning, and left the Asylum about eight or nine o'clock in the evening. He had his meals there; did not sleep there; he was about nineteen years of age, but could not exactly tell. He did not learn music, but walked about with the girls. We heard that it was Mr. Fleury's wish that he should have his meals here. He used to walk about the yard whenever the ladies came to read; he was never present when any ladies were here; he left the work-room when the ladies came. There were complaints made respecting this man, and he

* Why necessary for Mr. Fleury to have a *Board* on such a matter?

† No later than Sunday evening, the 22nd February last, Mr. Charles Fleury and some young gentlemen from his father's school, or it may be his acquaintances, took possession of the organ-loft in the Chapel, had a pair of candles lit, and chatted together. Mr. Charles Fleury presided at the organ instead of one of the blind women; he sent a message during the week to those inmates who sang, to come and practice with him, but they all declined. Comments on this indecorous proceeding in the House of God in an Asylum for Blind Females are quite unnecessary!

was removed. It is hardly necessary to observe that this communication, elicited by numerous questions, created sensations of the utmost astonishment and indignation amongst most of the gentlemen present at the meeting, in the midst of which the Rev. C. M. Fleury came forward, and said, this matter was a very simple affair, and could easily be explained. The fact was, the Earl of Mayo sent a boy up to Dublin on his way to Liverpool, and as his lordship wanted him to see the Asylum, he (the Chaplain) accordingly sent the boy here, but how long he remained he did not know. In answer to certain questions, Mr. Fleury proceeded to say that the Matron complained to him of the conduct of the boy—he was getting *troublesome*, and he sent the boy away. The boy was a *convert*. Some gentlemen asked Mr. Fleury if he was not aware there was an Asylum in Sackville-street, Dublin, *for Blind Men*, and they wished to know why Mr. Fleury, the Chaplain, did not send this individual to that Asylum *for men* rather than to the Molyneux. We did not hear that Mr. Fleury had anything farther to say in explanation of this remarkable fact. We have since the meeting heard somewhat further of this man, and we beg to refer parties to page 19 of the Statement of the Committee, where they will find that this boy, as Mr. Fleury calls him, was about twenty years of age, and was expelled from the Richmond Asylum, in the year 1851, *for bad conduct*.* Anne M'Goey resumed her evidence, and said she told her sister that she heard Mary Tremble assist the Matron up stairs; she did not help, but only wondered. In reply to a question put to Anne M'Goey by Mr. White, the barrister (who was defending the Matron) as to how she remembered the exact date of Mary Tremble taking the Matron up to bed, and yet could not remember an occurrence but a few months back, she said the reason she knew it to be in June was that she had a letter which was dated the 17th of June, and she got it on the 18th; it was while that letter was being read to her that she heard Mary Tremble taking the Matron up stairs; her foot was heavy and powerless—they knew each other by the tread of the foot. *No Visiting Ladies were attending the Asylum*; even if there had been a Committee of Ladies she did not know she would have complained—as one person she would not like to have come forward. The Resident Chaplain, the Rev. H. V. White, *was not allowed to interfere*. Mr. Ferrier (the Trustee who had just resigned) *when in Dublin* could be spoken to by the inmates, but since he left, there was no person that any of them could speak to—the *Trustees never came into the work-room*. She knows Bridget Murphy [see No 7]; they do not think her clear, always thought her of weak intellect. *Mary Tremble has the keys of the pantry*; heard that she differed with the late Assistant-Matron about the keeping of the keys. Knew the Cook to be drunk; she believed her to be also a Roman Catholic.

14. *Eliza O'Brien*, twenty-seven years in the house. She observed the Matron often much overcome by drink for the last eight years; knew it by the thickness of her voice, which was apparent when she was reading in the evening. She was sitting in her room one Saturday evening and heard her assisted up stairs by Mary Tremble. One summer evening—she could not exactly give the date—she went to the door to find out what the noise was; she thought it was a great weight coming up stairs, and when she found it was Mary and the Matron she went away, she did not assist them; this occurred between nine and ten o'clock. The Matron appeared like one losing her speech. She (*Eliza O'Brien*) had spoken to Susannah Jenks and Mary Mason; they often prayed that the Lord would convert the Matron, or that He would bring the matter to light. It was a subject they much disliked to speak of. It might be a couple of years back; they spoke of it last Friday when the Matron employed Mr. White (the barrister). Mary Tremble was then examined, and they believed

* There was not any truth in the assertion that this blind man was on his way to the Liverpool Asylum, but after leaving the Molyneux he was in the Poor-house.

also the servants. The Assistant Matron was not in the Asylum. She supposed the inmates would be questioned, and she said to Margaret M'Donnell that if they were asked any questions she hoped they would all speak the truth. Bridget Murphy [No 7] is not considered over bright.

15. *Jane M'Kee*, thirteen years an inmate; she observed the Matron often the worse for drink for about eight years back: knew it by the thickness of her voice, could not say how often. Never knew the Matron to be carried up to bed; heard Mary Tremble help the Matron up stairs. The Matron passes her bedroom in going up stairs. She was in the country about two years back, she returned in September. Sometimes the Matron is better than at other times; *her voice is never thick in the morning*; her voice has not been thick of an evening *for the last month*.* She cannot say exactly whether this has been the case for the last two months; she will only speak of the last month. In answer to some questions this witness further said—sometimes there has not been enough broth for all the women, and when this is the case they can get nothing *but a piece of bread for dinner*.

16. *Mary Mason*, twenty-seven years an inmate: she has known the Matron to drink for the last seven or eight years, chiefly by the thickness of her voice when reading. She heard her helped up to bed one night by Mary Tremble—one Saturday night, nearly ten o'clock. She then knew the Matron's state by her helpless, heavy walking. The Matron is absent for two days generally every week; the broth was very bad.

17. *Rebecca Sheridan*, sixteen years an inmate. When asked if she knew the Matron to drink "Yes," she said, "she thought she took too much drink by the thickness of her voice, and thinks it about eight years. She (the witness) was absent about two years back. The housemaid is a Roman Catholic. She knew Kate Read; she had been an inmate in the Asylum for ten years; she and all the women felt the removal of Kate Read exceedingly; she was so affected by it that she was obliged to leave the church on account of her crying." [Dr. Bigger was asking her questions at this time, and the Chairman (a Trustee) interfered, and would not allow more questions to be put; after some discussion the Doctor submitted to the Chairman. It may be said that questions were repeatedly objected to as not affecting the matter at issue. Dr. Bigger was going to ask whether Mr. Harris, (the same individual who wrote the letter to him to postpone the meeting of the 11th of July—which letter it may be remembered was totally repudiated by all the Trustees) spoke to her on the subject—the fact is, Mr. Harris told Rebecca Sheridan if she cried after Kate Read she would be sent away from the Asylum as Kate was!]

18. *Ellen Crawford*, seventeen years an inmate. Said she had noticed the conduct of the Matron; she could not read so well in the evening as in the morning, but did not observe it every evening. It was very painful to speak of it; *had not seen anything amiss for the last month*.* Did not know her to be assisted up to bed. From half-past seven to ten o'clock of an evening she repeats verses, and would not be likely to hear anything; repeats the verses in the yard. She does not taste the broth, she gets bread, or *waits for tea*.

19. *Anne Graham*, three years an inmate. Said she had observed the Matron did not read in the evening as she did in the morning. This occurred sometimes, but could not tell how often; she knew it by the thickness of speech. She often goes for a week to a friend, a lady, who resides in Dorset-st.

20. *Kate Hooley*, nine years in the Molyneux; has seen something wrong in the Matron; she is given to drink; thickness of voice, has observed it for four years. Has only heard her once assisted up stairs by Mary Tremble; never heard a noise but once. The Matron had to pass her bedroom door to go to her chamber. As the Matron and Mary Tremble passed, Mary said "*take care*;" they had a candle. [One of the Trustees made some observation about the candle, as much as to say that he did not understand why having a candle was any proof of the Matron being on the spot, but a gentleman said

* That was from the 11th July last.

"*blind people do not require a candle.*"] Never heard the Matron hoarse in the morning, but constantly in the evening; had spoken of it since the last meeting. She had the Matron's directions, but could not always understand her; the Matron would always answer when spoken to, but still she could not always be understood.

This concluded the evidence of the inmates, some were away from the Asylum visiting their friends, and others were girls who had but lately entered. Thus twenty inmates were examined, out of which number only two gave evidence in favor of the Matron. One of them (Mary Tremble) was proved again and again, and she also admitted herself that she was treated quite differently to any of the other women; the other inmate (Biddy Murphy) was considered by all the women to be of weak mind and intellect. [See page 41, number 7.]

Margaret Ring, the former Assistant Matron, was called again into the room, and, in reply to certain questions, she said that the cause of the difference between her and Mary Tremble was, that Mary had a *second key of the pantry*, which she, Margaret Ring, strongly objected to. Mary Tremble was allowed to have this key by the Matron, and she could go to the pantry and take what she pleased.

The case against the Matron now closed.

As it was getting late in the afternoon it was considered impossible to enter into the defence, and the meeting was adjourned to the next day (Friday), at half-past eleven o'clock.

Before the meeting was broken up Mr. Allnutt drew attention to the following fact, namely—that the list of inmates then on the table, made out by the Rev. C. M. Fleury and the Matron, did not appear to him to contain the names of all the women. Mr. Allnutt requested that this list should be carefully looked over, which was done by Mr. Fleury, *Mr. Harris*, and the Matron, and they declared that it was a correct list. "Then," said Mr. Allnutt, "this proves the statement to be incorrect that we have seen in the advertisement so often repeated in *Saunders' Newspaper* about Mary Callaghan." (See page 23.) For instance:—

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Interns and externs, on paper laid before this meeting | 31 |
| Number of externs therein - - -[subtract | 3 |
| | <hr/> 28 |
| Women just entered this year (Anne Burnett, Ellen Devlin, and Mary Callaghan) - -[subtract | 3 |
| | <hr/> 25 |
| One little girl died in last year (Mary Walsh) [add | 1 |
| | <hr/> |
| True number in the past year | 26 only, not 28. |

The following is a list of the twenty-six inmates (interns) in the Molyneux Asylum, 1855, also showing the externs, and the three women who last election entered the Institution :—

| | Name of Inmates. | Yes or No, when asked if the charges was true? | Number of years in Asylum. | Age. | Remarks. |
|----|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|------|---|
| 1 | Letty Lawless ... | — | — | — | Not examined being ill, confined to her room. |
| 2 | Mary M'Donnell ... | Yes | 40 | 57 | |
| 3 | Margaret Roberts... | Yes | 35 | 52 | |
| 4 | Susannah Jenks ... | Yes | 35 | 42 | |
| 5 | Martha Bidwell ... | Yes | 30 | 54 | |
| 6 | Anne M'Goey ... | Yes | 20 | 30 | |
| 7 | Mary M'Goey ... | Yes | 20 | 28 | |
| 8 | Catherine Maguire | Yes | 32 | 43 | |
| 9 | Mary Tremble ... | No | 30 | — | |
| 10 | Bridget Murphy ... | No | 30 | — | |
| 11 | Mary Mason ... | Yes | 27 | 33 | |
| 12 | Susan Groves ... | — | — | — | On a visit to her friends. |
| 13 | Alicia Morgan ... | — | — | — | On a visit to her friends. |
| 14 | Rebecca Sheridan... | Yes | 16 | 27 | |
| 15 | Jane Scott ... | Yes | 22 | 31 | |
| 16 | Jane M'Kee ... | Yes | 13 | 28 | |
| 17 | Ellen Whitley ... | Yes | 23 | 33 | |
| 18 | Ellen Crawford ... | Yes | 17 | 36 | |
| 19 | Margaret M'Donnell | Yes | 23 | 29 | |
| 20 | Ann Graham .. | Yes | 3 | 31 | |
| 21 | Anne Joyce ... | — | — | — | On a visit to her friends. |
| 22 | Kate Hooley ... | Yes | 9 | 18 | |
| 23 | Elizabeth Nelson ... | Yes | 23 | 35 | |
| 24 | Eliza O'Brien ... | Yes | 27 | 36 | |
| 25 | Olivia Walsh ... | — | — | — | Not examined--very young. |
| 26 | Mary Walsh, Entered 1856 | Deceased | — | — | Died in November, 1855. |
| 26 | Anne Burnett ... | — | — | — | Elected, 15th April, 1856. |
| 27 | Ellen Devlin ... | — | — | — | Elected, 15th April, 1856. |
| 28 | Mary Callaghan,... | — | — | — | Put in, without an Election. |
| | Externs | | | | |
| 29 | Margaret Kenagh* | — | — | — | An Extern. |
| 30 | Charlotte Lodge ... | — | — | — | An Extern. |
| 31 | Kate Read .. | Yes | — | — | An Extern. |
| | * Or Keane. | | | | |

We have been very careful in showing the number of years each of the inmates have been in the Asylum, for persons at a distance may suppose the inmates to be young girls and therefore easily worked on to *join in a conspiracy*.

The advertisement says there were *twenty-eight* women in the Asylum in the *past year*.—(See page 23.)

Mr. White, the Matron's *legal adviser*, instantly took up the matter, and said "*Oh! what is the date of the newspaper?*" Mr. Allnutt and others instantly asked him what the date of the newspaper had to do with the question. The advertisement says—"number of inmates during the past year *twenty-eight*," and from this number the average cost of individual maintenance is calculated. This is not the only erroneous statement to be found in that advertisement. We have spoken of one of the externs having only £5 a year from the Asylum, and another having half the cost of her keep paid by a lady; in short the cost of the three extern is about £25 a year, viz. —Kate Read, £5, Margaret Keane, (or Kenagh,) about £12, Charlotte Lodge, about £8. We say *about*, for although Mr. Harris has been written to for the exact cost, he has not given any information on the subject. Well, if £25 is taken from £560, the cost of maintenance, including washing, there remains £535, which being divided by twenty-six, the true number of inmates, it appears that £20 12s. is the individual cost of maintenance; and even in this, bear in mind that some of the inmates go and see their friends for a period of *one and two months at a time*.

We say this error in the number of inmates is not the only erroneous statement in the advertisement. Mr. Fleury, (as Chaplain and Secretary,) is responsible for the truth of the contents, says that Mary Callaghan is *totally blind*; is this true? (she is also said to be *totally blind* in the voting paper). Anne Burnett is said to be partially blind, which is true; and Mary Callaghan totally blind, *this is not true*—Mary Callaghan has been out to walk constantly since Mr. Fleury put her into the Asylum and Anne Burnett not. The reason assigned for it was—that Burnett was not yet able to walk with the other women—(when will she be if she is never taken out?)—for that Mary Callaghan could see *a little*; indeed she could tell that a lady had red or pink stripes on her dress. Here is error the second, and now we proceed to the third error, which is far worse than the others. It says—that the *Visiting Ladies were present*,—the Trustees know how strenuously at the first meeting Mr. Fleury endeavoured to make it appear that the Visiting Ladies were all in being and in action. This has been proved again and again to be utterly untrue—the Visiting Ladies have been done away with for about *nine years*. The Trustees themselves now admit that there have been no Visiting Ladies for years;

true it is, there are *Readers*—a few ladies who read between the hours of twelve and two o'clock, *but they have no power whatever to interfere*. Mr. Fleury not only permits an erroneous statement to appear again and again before the public, but he induces one of his friends to attach his name to the advertisement, who knows nothing whatever respecting the Asylum. The Rev. C. S. Stanford should know what he is doing before he puts his name to documents; he may as well sign a blank cheque, and be entirely ignorant of the amount for which it will be filled up, as to attach his name to a statement of which he has no personal knowledge whatever.

EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFENCE.

Friday, August 8th.

Alicia Green—has been house-maid for six and a-half years; is a Roman Catholic; *was tormented by Margaret Ring*; was not asked what religion she was when engaged. She attends the Matron early and late, has constant intercourse with her. The cook always takes up the Matron's dinner about four o'clock, and takes up *filtered water*. Has an opportunity of seeing the Matron at her dinner—she always drinks water at her dinner—she never saw the Matron take ale, or porter, or spirits, or wine since she was in the house—the *Matron could not take wine without her knowing it*. Never observed her under the influence of strong drink. Remembers two years back; never knew the Matron to be assisted up to bed. She (*Alicia Green*) has never attended confession since she has been at the Asylum. [She asserted that *Margaret Ring* had tormented her. It could not be discovered in what way she was tormented by the late Assistant Matron; she said distinctly that *Margaret Ring* had not insisted on her attending the Asylum Chapel, neither had she prevented her going to a Roman Catholic chapel.] On asking the housemaid if *Lilly*, the sexton, dined at the Institution, the Chairman would not allow her to answer the question. She proceeded to say she had not ever spoken to anyone excepting on last Friday, when *Mr. White* asked her the same questions as to-day—the *Matron never said a word to her*; she said a gentleman would call and examine her. This was her first situation. She did not attend confession, because she thought she was not going to stay in the Asylum. Never asked the Matron (six and a-half years) to let her go. No one prevented her going to confession.

Catherine Toler—has been cook at this Institution above four years; is a Protestant; attends the Matron constantly; she takes up her dinner on a tray: *never takes up a glass*; never saw *port wine or ale* since she came into the Asylum. There is a filter kept in the house, *but the Matron never has any filtered water at her dinner*. There are no glasses kept in her room. She has never anything to drink at her dinner. The Matron is strictly sober as she sits there now. She (*Catherine Toler*) proceeded to say that while she was at the door she overheard *Eliza O'Brien* say to the inmates she had told Mr. Allnutt that *Mary Tremble* dragged the Matron up to bed drunk, she was asked by him if that was the truth, and she said it was. She added that some of the inmates would stand to what she was saying, but not all. She (*Catherine*

Toler) has not drank for some time past, but she has taken more than she should have done. The Matron only observed it once. She (Catherine Toler) has drank often, but was not incapable of doing her work. Never knew the house-maid (Green) help the Matron up to bed; knew Margaret Ring, the late Assistant-Matron, she said if ever she was Matron "*she would make Dungarvan shake!*" Cannot say whether this was said before or after the notice to leave. The Matron never mentioned that she was to be examined this day. In answer to a question put to the cook by Mr. Allnutt as to the cost of the buttermilk on a Monday, she said it was *threepence*; and on Mr. A. saying something about the fact that the Matron had much more than threepence set down; she began to prevaricate, and stated that perhaps the man might have paid for more.

John Lilly, the Sexton and Messenger, sees the Matron early and late, and very frequently after four o'clock in the afternoon. Never saw anything remarkable about her; always understood what she was reading; never observed any thickness in her voice, never observed her to be intoxicated. He did not think it could take place without his knowledge. In answer to some questions from Mr. Allnutt as to whether he did not have his meals at the Asylum, Lilly admitted he had some food at the Asylum, but not his dinner. He did not think it wrong his taking it, if he had he would not have had anything. When Mr. Allnutt offered him money for a Report of the Asylum he thought there was something wrong about Mr. Allnutt. [Lilly having volunteered this statement, Mr. Allnutt stated to the meeting that it was quite true he had offered a few shillings for some old Reports of the Institution, (*he still offers ten shillings for a complete set of the thirteen Reports.*) This man Lilly has a peculiarly nice idea of what is right and wrong; he can eat and drink at the expense of the Asylum, but to offer any money for an old Report of the Molyneux Asylum is, in his opinion, a sin of the deepest dye. At this stage of the proceedings we observed the Rev. Dr. Stanford (a Trustee) ask one of the other Trustees whether *the Reports were not sold*. Poor man! in his total ignorance of everything connected with the Institution, he had yet to learn that no Report has been given to the subscribers for many years past but that of last March, and that Mr. Fleury says he will not favour us with another for five years.] Lilly proceeded to say that he supplied the Asylum with coals and shoes, and that he lived in his house *rent free*.

The Matron—Has been fourteen years over the Institution; *drinks water and sometimes wine at her dinner*—a quarter of a glass. Goes to the work-room to read. No former Matron ever read—she does it for the improvement as well as the amusement of the inmates. Dr. Cusack attended her in 1851–52; she is not strong; in 1849 she suffered from fatigue. She retires about ten o'clock; she had selected Mary Tremble from the first; she attached herself to her; she could not shake her off. She frequently goes to Claremont to see her mother, who has been dying for the last three years. Mr. Ferrier gave her leave to go away for the benefit of her health some time back, and as it was more convenient for her to go out weekly than at a stated time, she was allowed to make that arrangement. [Mr. Ferrier having resigned, no application could be made to him as to the nature of the leave of absence given to the Matron. It may be said that one Trustee had no power whatever to give such a permission; the Trust Deed requires not less than three Trustees to form a quorum to conduct the business, and we beg to add that even if it was true that Mr. Ferrier gave the Matron permission to leave the Asylum for a month or so, perhaps six years ago, that could not be construed into a permission to leave the Asylum two days every week:] The Matron proceeded to say that she was not present at the death of Jane Byrne, one of the inmates, for she was not at the Asylum that night. She admitted she had given Margaret Ring the character which had been produced and read, but that Margaret Ring was insolent. [Mr. Allnutt asked the Matron

how she could reconcile the evidence of her two servants, for Alicia Green, the house-maid, had stated that the Matron drank *nothing but filtered water at dinner*, whereas the cook, Catherine Toler, had distinctly declared that the Matron *had never any water, or in fact any drink whatever at dinner*, and yet the Matron stated that she *had both wine and water*. We do not remember that she endeavoured to explain this discrepancy in the evidence of the servants.]

In reference to the items in the book of incidental expenses, which was again produced, the Matron said, that instead of putting down too much, "*she was sure she had set down too little for buttermilk*," and, after much questioning, it came out, although the various items were set down as having been purchased on a certain day, this was not the case; the dates were as nothing; for instance, that if 6d. or 9d. was set down for buttermilk on Monday, the 13th June, only 3d. might be spent on the 13th, but that the balance had been expended during the week. In like manner, the charge of about 2s. for bread regularly every Monday, was not the servants bread, although it was entered immediately after the weekly money given to each servant, but this 2s. was bread bought at various times through the week. Now this kind of excuse, lame as it was, would in some degree acquit the Matron of the charge of erroneous entries, if it was correct, (we shall speak again of this presently); and Mr. Allnutt remarked to the Matron "well, you have in this particular instance brought such charges on yourself, for you have no right whatever to put down dates for the various purchases, unless those purchases have been made on the days specified; the dates are, in fact, nonsense, and if this is your practice the whole quarter's accounts, from 1st April to the end of June, *could easily be written out at one and the same time*. Why do you put dates unless to *doctor your accounts*. It should especially be remarked that, although it was now the 8th of August, *yet the account books had not been totted up since the end of March last*, when Mr. Harris was supposed to have examined the book of incidental expenses. And even here, as in everything connected with the Asylum, a check was wanting. Mr. Harris never even signed the book at the end of the quarter, so that really there was nothing to prove that the accounts had been examined so far by him. We ask how is it possible for any one to know what they are expending, and how they are going on *without balancing their accounts?* and how can they balance unless their books are totted? It may be said that the accounts may have been totted, but not entered as such. If this had been the case, without

doubt mention would have been made of it. The mere writing in the amount does not occupy a moment, the totting up is the difficult part, if any difficulty exists. In the loose way in which this book of incidental expenses is kept, there is nothing whatever to prevent a person setting down the whole quarter's expenses *the last day of the quarter, to make it come up as near as possible to the amount received*. Much was said at this period of the examination about the collections, and although great reluctance was exhibited by the Trustees to produce the book of the Sundays' collection, yet, as Mr. Sutton, and other gentlemen, declared they would not give another penny unless this book was produced, the Trustees were obliged to bring it forward, and on Mr. Sutton looking over it, he instantly remarked on the singularity of there always appearing a deficit in the amount of the entries in the Matron's book, when compared with the entries made in the Vestry of the Chapel; fourpenny pieces had it appeared been mistaken for sixpences, or threepenny pieces for fourpenny, but a mistake did not appear to have occurred the other way; when they counted the collection over a second time *they made it amount to LESS than the first time*. This was certainly a curious fact; some how or other the gentlemen who first counted the money made a mistake, and made too much!

The amount of the Sundays' collections is ascertained after service, it is then entered in a book, and the cash is put into a box, of which the Matron has a key—the box containing the money is taken charge of by the Matron. This was invariably the practice. The Matron makes use of this cash in the payment of the incidental expenses. We have no means whatever of knowing whether the whole or part only of the Sundays' collections is paid away for incidental expenses by the Matron! The Trustees appeared to know nothing, or at all events they would not condescend to give us (the subscribers) the least information—in short, we were teaching these gentlemen the very rudiments of their education, as far as concerns their duties as Trustees to the Molyneux Asylum.

Mr. Allnutt asked the Matron if she could account for the extra quantity of porter that was consumed in the Asylum? Having had a copy of the grocer's account for the quarter, from 1st January to 29th March last, amounting to £25 14s. 8d., it appeared there had been 28 dozen of porter, 2 dozen 10 bottles of ale, and 13 bottles of wine used [see p. 56]. Now if only *seven* of the elder women had one bottle of porter amongst *three of them*, it would give 18 dozen of porter consumed in the quarter.

What became of the 10 dozen of porter and the 3 dozen of ale, to say nothing of the wine, which the women had declared they never tasted? We are not aware that an attempt at any explanation was offered. The housemaid is a teetotaller, and never drinks porter; so there remained the cook and assistant-matron to drink the 13 dozen of porter and ale, it may be, with the assistance of Lilly. Attention was also called to the *almonds and raisins, figs, citron, currants*, that appeared in the said bill, but some of the gentlemen *thought this nothing*. We have heard that, in uniformity with all the other subsequent proceedings of the Trustees, *that the grocer has been changed*. We suppose it was a grievous, unpardonable offence to let us have a copy of the quarter's account! Some parties may suppose that the wine might have been obtained for the clergyman, and also used in the ordinances of the church. This is not the case. The wine used at the Sacrament is obtained from another wine merchant in Stephen's-green. For copy of the grocer's bill, see page 55. We may add that, during the examination of the Matron a request was made to the chairman that two of the inmates should be present, but such was not allowed. We think that as she had heard what the inmates had to say, that two of the blind women should have been allowed by the Trustees to hear her examination, and we beg further to say, that immediately after this meeting, we applied to Margaret Ring as to whether it was true bread was purchased continually during the week? She replied "Oh no! How could such be regularly the case, when the baker calls three times a week." True it is that a loaf of bread may sometimes be required, but the entry for bread is regularly to be seen in the book of incidental expenses every Monday. Then, again, with respect to buttermilk, Margaret Ring asserts that it is only purchased on Monday, and that threepence is about the charge which should be set down.

We have rather digressed, but still the statements we have entered into are true, and required to be dwelt on. To proceed—

Thomas Evans was examined—Has been eleven years as collector and assistant-secretary to the Asylum; previous to the last three years was in the habit of frequenting the Asylum morning, mid-day, and evening; had seen the Matron suffering from ill health, but not of evenings; saw her hoarse a long time ago; never saw the remotest sign of tippling; never called during the last three years on any other evening than Saturday, not later than four o'clock; did not notice the hoarseness more than four times during the eleven years; never heard her reading; so far as he had seen, she was of strictly sober habits.

Dr. Churchill is attendant physician to this Institution; is here two or three times a week *if there are any inmates sick*; does not come unless he is sent for, except in the event of illness; has no fixed hours; the Matron has consulted him about her health; when any of the inmates are ill he has been at the Asylum after dinner, but as a general rule he attends in the morning; never observed any appearance of drink on her; sometimes orders wine to be given to the inmates; it is not necessary to order them wine frequently; there is no wine taken regularly by his orders; keeps no entry of his calls, or the wine ordered; has attended at the Asylum about twelve times after six o'clock in the evening for the last three years.

Mr. Clarke, the superintendent of Claremont Institution, of which Asylum Dr. Stanford, we believe is, or was, on the Committee, gave his evidence in favor of the party (the Matron is his sister-in-law). We do not understand how he could be supposed to know what was going on in the Molyneux Asylum. Be that as it may, he spoke of the Matron's strictly temperate habits, and gave the same kind of negative evidence as Lilly, Evans, and Dr. Churchill—evidence of but little value in any court of justice, when put in opposition to the clear testimony of people who saw the Matron in the state she was accused of by Margaret Ring, Kate Read, and Maria Franklin, the assistant-matron, coupled with the touching, affecting, and truthful evidence of eighteen blind women (out of twenty who were examined). The evidence for the defence reminds us forcibly of the exclamation of a poor man on his trial for some offence, who cried out to the judge as he was about to sentence him—"Ah! sure your worship will not sentence me on the evidence of three boys, when I can bring forward a hundred who didn't see me do it." Yes, after these blind inmates were urged by the Trustees (especially Mr. Armstrong, the chairman) to speak the truth, and *not to fear*, after they most reluctantly told what they had endured so patiently for the last six or eight years, they were then branded with the stigma of lying, not singly, but in combination. The Trustees appeared determined to cushion everything; for they but too well knew the greatest blame would most justly be eventually thrown on themselves. No; this would not do. How could the Trustees submit to have the accounts examined. Would they like the public to pry into their affairs, and see how they had fulfilled their plain duties? It is in the recollection of the gentlemen who were present at the examination, that one of the poor women being very anxious to know who (amongst the Trustees) was in the room, asked "*is Mr. Moore here?*" "Yes," said that old gentleman, with great complacency, for the women added, "*we love Mr. Moore.*" Did he merit this compliment? Pause for a moment to hear this question

answered. "Pray, how long is it since Mr. Moore spoke to you?" said Mr. Allnutt. "*Oh! about twelve years!*" We subsequently asked the women why they liked Mr. Moore? "Oh!" said they, "a long time ago when we complained to him about our milk being bad, he spoke of it to the person, and we had far better." So, although he had not spoken to them for about twelve years, still these poor inmates loved him! As to the other Trustees, not one of them ever troubled himself to go near the women. The truth must be told, the easiest way of managing the Molyneux Asylum was, *first to get rid of all the Visiting Ladies*; they were troublesome (some one said); and, secondly, as there then remained no one to interfere with the Trustees, they quietly handed all the management to Mr. Fleury, the chaplain and secretary, and he in his turn handed over the concern to the matron, *a most convenient arrangement*—it has gradually come to this result. Some of the Trustees flatter themselves that they, at all events, cannot be accused of negligence. One of these gentlemen met Mr. Allnutt in Dawson-street after the first meeting (which this Trustee did not attend), and he accosted Mr. A., and asked him how they got on. "Oh," said Mr. Allnutt, "you should have been there; I suppose you have heard what charges have been preferred against the matron?" "Oh, yes, I have," said Mr. Bickerstaff, and, furthermore, "*I know them to be true. You know I have been a Trustee only about two years, and I have frequently brought forward reformations, but have been always put down.*" Mr. Allnutt asked him if he had ever read the Trust Deed. "*No, I have not,*" said this gentleman. This was a pretty admission; he had been a Trustee for *two years* and had never read the Trust Deed; and yet Mr. Fleury says in his letter (*see p. 6*) "*That the Trustees are very thoughtful men, and regulate everything by a Trust Deed.*" Mr. Allnutt lent Mr. Bickerstaff a copy of the Deed and he had it copied. Well, to proceed, before the meeting broke up, the chairman was heard to say that the matron left the room perfectly innocent of the charges; and yet, at the same time, although Mr. Armstrong expressed himself in this manner, he very gravely gave us to understand *that the Trustees would come to a decision shortly*, and the result would be communicated to us. Before we parted, the Rev. Dr. Stanford announced that he was prepared at any time to give the Matron a written testimonial. He was quite as ready to do this as to support his friend, Mr. Fleury, as respects the method of getting Mary Callaghan into the Asylum without any election.

After the publication in the "Statement" containing the correspondence that passed between the Committee and the Trustees, it will not be necessary for us to repeat those letters, more than to say that the Trustees sent to Dr. Bigger a communication, dated the 14th August, stating that they had deliberately weighed and considered the evidence given before them on the 6th, 7th, and 8th inst. (how can they call this four days?), and it was their opinion that the charges were not substantiated.

Before we proceed to the subsequent proceedings, we beg to give a copy of the Grocers' account, for the first quarter of the year 1856:—

The Governors of the Molyneux Asylum, Francis Falkner, Tea and Wine Merchant, 78, Grafton-street, Dublin.

| 1856. | | | £ | s. | d. |
|-------|-----|--|----|-----------------|------|
| Jan. | 1. | 1 lb. arrowroot, 2s.; 1 stone sugar, 7s.; 1 doz. porter, 4s. ... | 13 | 0 | |
| " | 4. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; $\frac{1}{2}$ doz. ditto, 2s.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d. 2 lb. sugar, 1s. 2d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ stone lump, 2s. 4d.; 1 bottle Cayenne, 1s.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. pepper, 9d. | 12 | 8 | |
| " | | $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. mustard, 10d. | 5 | 3 | |
| " | 5. | 1 lb. coffee, 1s. 8d.; 1 stone sugar, 7s.; 9th, 1 doz. porter, 4s. vine- gar, 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. | 0 | 10 | |
| " | 12. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 stone sugar, 6s. 5d. ... | 13 | 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ | |
| " | | 10 lb. tea, £1 12s. 6d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. arrowroot, 1s. ... | 13 | 6 | |
| " | 15. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 1s.; 2 lb. figs, 2s. ... | 10 | 8 | |
| " | 17. | 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d. | 5 | 10 | |
| " | 18. | 3 bottles porter, 1s. | 1 | 0 | |
| " | 19. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d. ... | 12 | 10 | |
| " | 22. | 1 doz. porter, 4s. | 4 | 0 | |
| " | 25. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; $\frac{1}{2}$ doz. ale, 2s.; 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d. ... | 11 | 10 | |
| " | | 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 1s. | 4 | 8 | |
| " | 26. | 1 bottle port, 3s.; 2 lb. raisins, 1s. 8d. | 4 | 8 | |
| " | 29. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. mustard, 1s. ... | 10 | 10 | |
| Feb. | 1. | 4 bottles porter, 1s. 4d.; 10 lb. tea, £1 12s. 6d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. Hyson, 1s. 8d.; 2 lb. raisins, 2s. | 17 | 6 | |
| " | | Almonds, 4d.; citron, 2d.; 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. currants, 1s. 6d. | 2 | 0 | |
| " | 2. | 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d.; 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d. ... | 11 | 2 | |
| " | | 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 pint of malt liquor, 1s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. pepper, 9d. ... | 5 | 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ | |
| " | 5. | 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d.; 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 8th, 3 bottles porter, 1s. ... | 10 | 10 | |
| " | 9. | 1 stone sugar, 5s. 10d.; 18 bottles porter, 6s.; 1 bottle port, 3s. ... | 14 | 10 | |
| " | | 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 1s.; 2 lb. raisins, 1s. 8d.; mace, 8d. ... | 7 | 0 | |
| " | 13. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 14th, 1 stone sugar, 5s. 3d.; 1 doz. porter, 4s. ... | 13 | 3 | |
| " | 16. | Ginger, 4d.; 1 stone sugar, 5s. 3d.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. lump, 2s. ... | 10 | 8 | |
| " | 19. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 20th, 10 lb. tea, £1 12s. 6d. | 16 | 6 | |
| " | 22. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 stone sugar, 5s. 3d. | 13 | 7 | |
| " | | 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 11d.; 26th, 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 14 lb. sugar, 5s. 3d. | 13 | 10 | |
| " | 29. | 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ doz. porter, 6s.; 14 lb. sugar, 5s. 3d.; pepper, 9d.; 1 bottle port, 3s. ... | 15 | 0 | |
| March | 4. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 14 lb. sugar, 4s. 8d. | 13 | 0 | |
| " | | 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 10d.; 8th, 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d. | 9 | 10 | |
| " | 8. | 1 stone sugar, 4s. 8d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. mustard, 1s. | 5 | 8 | |
| " | 11. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 10 lb. tea, £1 12s. 6d.; 14th, 1 stone sugar, 4s. 8d. ... | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| " | 15. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d.; 1 bottle port, 3s.; 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d. | 12 | 0 | |
| " | | 2 lb. sugar, 11d.; 2 lb. raisins, 2s.; vinegar, 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. | 3 | 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ | |
| " | 18. | 1 stone sugar, 4s. 8d.; 1 doz. porter, 4s. | 8 | 8 | |
| " | 22. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d.; 1 bottle port, 3s. | 8 | 4 | |
| " | | 14 lb. sugar, 4s. 8d.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. pepper, 9d. | 5 | 5 | |
| " | 26. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 1 stone sugar, 4s. 8d. | 8 | 8 | |
| " | 29. | 1 doz. porter, 4s.; 4 bottles ale, 1s. 4d.; 1 lb. tea, 3s. 8d.; 2 lb. sugar, 10d. 1 bottle port, 3s.; $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. tea, 1s. 8d.; 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. lump sugar, 1s. 11d.; 10 lb. tea, £1 12s. 6d. | 9 | 10 | |
| | | | £ | 25 | 14 8 |

ANALYSIS OF FALKNER'S (THE GROCER'S) ACCOUNT.

| QUANTITIES. | ARTICLES. | AMOUNT. | REMARKS. |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 23 stone | Sugar | £ s. d. 6 9 5 | 25 lbs. weekly, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. daily. |
| 28 doz. 4 bot. | Porter | 5 13 4 | 26 bottles weekly, or almost 4 bottles daily |
| 2 doz. 10 bot. | Ale | - 11 4 | Nearly 3 Bottles weekly. |
| 13 bottles ... | Port Wine | 1 19 0 | 1 Bottle weekly. |
| $58\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. ... | Tea | 9 15 2 | $4\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. weekly. |
| 1 lb. ... | Coffee | - 1 8 | |
| 1 bottle ... | Malt Liquor | - 1 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ | |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. ... | Arrowroot | - 3 0 | |
| | Pepper, Mustard, &c. | - 7 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ | |
| | Figs, Raisins, &c. | - 12 4 | 8 lb. Raisins, 7s 8d, included in this item. |
| | Total Amount | £ 25 14 8 | or £102 18s. 8d. per annum. |

This is the only account we have been enabled to look over, and assuredly it presents some very remarkable features. The bottle of wine regularly supplied for years, of which the inmates scarcely ever had any, but which the Matron admitted she had in addition to her good salary, although the Asylum was so much in debt; compare this item of port wine with the $1\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of arrowroot and 8 lbs. of raisins, the latter was not made into puddings, for the only pudding they had was once a year—namely, on Christmas-day. We understand $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of tea was used daily, which, for the quarter of the year, would be $45\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.; add to this, 3 lbs. for the Matron, it would make $48\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. consumed; and yet there was $58\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. used in the quarter of the year. We calculated the porter, as spoken of in page 51, and 18 dozen should have been used in the quarter of a year, instead of which $28\frac{1}{2}$ dozen were had, besides 2 dozen and 10 bottles of ale. Bear in mind, this Grocers' bill was only *one account*, and, after this specimen, what might we expect to see in other accounts?

Now, as respects Mr. Falkner's bill, of course no one could blame him in the slightest degree—he only supplied what was ordered by the Matron; but the Trustees, we repeat, thought it an unpardonable offence to have furnished a copy of the account to any Subscriber; and as we heard that the custom was withdrawn, we wrote and asked Mr. Falkner if the report was true. The following is his reply:—

“Dublin, November 28, 1856.

“SIR—In reply to your enquiry as to whether I continue to supply the Molyneux Asylum with goods, I have to say that since the month of September I have had no order to send any goods to that Institution.

“I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

“FRANCIS FALKNER.”

It will be observed in the “Statement” that the following Sunday after the investigation, Mr. Fleury would not allow the inmates to partake of the Holy Communion (the Matron attended), and yet on

the next occasion the inmates were permitted to attend, although they made no recantation of their evidence. And now, after this arbitrary conduct, and after the Assistant Matron had been dismissed, and the stipend of £5 per annum withdrawn from Kate Read,* the Rev. H. V. White, residing as Domestic Chaplain in the Asylum, received a letter from Mr. Fleury, full of the warmest protestations of friendship, and expressing the great pain he felt at being *ordered* to give him notice to leave the apartments he occupied in the Molyneux Asylum within a fortnight. The Rev. H. V. White called on Mr. Bickerstaff, a Trustee, with Mr. Fleury's note, at which he expressed great astonishment, being ignorant of the order, but said that perhaps it might have been given after he left the meeting of the Trustees. He recommended Mr. White to write and ask whether the Trustees had given the order, and if so, on what grounds, and after the lapse of some time the Rev. H. V. White obtained an interview with the Trustees, when he was informed that he would be permitted to remain if he would promise *not to receive any visits from Mr. Allnutt!*

Mr. White replied, that he believed his friend Mr. Allnutt to be a Christian man, who had the welfare of the Institution at heart, and that as long as he remained in Dublin, he would always be most happy to see him; that, if he acceded to such an unreasonable requirement, it would give some colour of truth to the false charge made against him, of having stirred up Mr. Allnutt to the course he had pursued, with regard to the reform of the Asylum. Mr. White added, that, if he still resided in the Asylum, he claimed to be quite unfettered as to the friends he chose to see. Much was said at this meeting that we do not care to repeat; one of the Trustees, Dr. Stanford, declared that Mr. Allnutt

* We really have not time to enter fully into the persecution that this late inmate has been made to endure, because she gave evidence against the Matron. A Lady applied to the Trustees for the quarter's stipend of £1 5s., and requested that Kate Read might resume her visits to her old and dear friends at the Molyneux: the trifling stipend was refused, as well as liberty to see her old companions; the former was refused on the most absurd grounds; the Trustees said it was mentioned in their Minute Book that Kate Read's annual stipend should cease as soon as she got into a situation! She has played the Seraphim at Clontarf Church, receiving a salary of £16 per annum, which could not be sufficient to sustain her. The Trustees and Mr. Fleury must have known this for the last four years, and they continued the payment of £5 per annum, until as we say, Kate Read gave evidence against the Matron. We also know for a fact, that Miss Jackson very kindly requested Mr. Fleury to allow her to take two of the inmates to see Kate Read at the Meath Hospital (where she is very ill), and she offered to pay the car hire; but Mr. Fleury refused to permit their going, even in the company of one of his Visiting Ladies! We call them his Visiting Ladies, for they are not properly appointed; their hands are tied, and they can do nothing independent, or without Mr. Fleury's guidance.

and all the inmates appeared to him *quite possessed*; Mr. Fleury also said he believed Mr. Allnutt was a Christian man, but that he was *quite gone*, putting his finger to his forehead. The Rev. H. V. White told the Trustees, that *he believed the inmates were incapable of acting in the false and malicious manner imputed to them*. He was, after this, permitted to keep his apartments, until the circumstance occurred mentioned in the "*Statement*," page 29. We cannot avoid expressing our great regret that the Rev. H. V. White undertook to be the bearer of any communication to the Secretary of the Committee from any person, especially that he should have bound himself by a promise not to divulge the name of the party; the very fact of anyone wishing Mr. White to make such a promise, was sufficient to show the nature of the whole proceeding.

In case some of our readers may not have the "*Statement*," at hand, we will give the propositions that the Rev. H. V. White, was deputed by some one to communicate to the Committee, desirous for Reform, from page 29 and 30 of the "*Statement*":—

"1st. If the Molyneux Reform Committee would give up all inquiry into the accounts, then that Miss Hines should be dismissed, provided that nothing she said after her dismissal should be credited.

"2nd. On same condition that the Rev. Wm. Craig should be invited as co-Chaplain, with equal rank and power with Mr. Fleury for some time, till Mr. Fleury could retire, and leave him in full possession of the Chaplaincy.

"3rd. That the Guardian and Committee of Visiting Ladies should be re-appointed.

"4th. That Kate Read should be restored the little annuity of £5, of which she has been deprived."

To return to the communication which the Rev. H. V. White was induced to make to the Hon. Secretary of the Committee, it appears he had another interview with the Trustees, and as he would not give up his authority, he was required to leave the Asylum. After Mr. White's summary dismissal, *three months have elapsed*, during which the inmates were without any religious instruction from a Clergyman—the morning and evening prayers being conducted by the Matron, or, in her absence, totally neglected. We again observe, had the name been known, the singular message could have been traced to its originator—*a father it doubtless had*;—if this had been done, perhaps the Trustees would have discovered that the proposition came actually from Mr. Fleury. The Rev. H. V. White was sacrificed to his sense of honor, and he truly kept his promise, much to his own hurt. Although we know much, we will not enter into the reasons, that some people think themselves justified in *injuring innocent parties*, as long as they can succour a friend. We do not envy the feelings of the man who deputed Mr. White to make the proposals to the Committee. We must be allowed to add, that there cannot be a doubt the Rev. H. V. White did really receive this communication,

and we believe that he has entirely satisfied His Grace the Archbishop on this point.

We must now turn to the kind of "*manifesto*" issued by the Trustees, dated 24th Nov. last, and, in addition, to what the Committee have so ably written, we have a few words to say on the subject. First, the Trustees reiterate the assertion we have before alluded to, viz., the assembling together a few blind women is, that there may be a *Church* in that locality. We beg to deny this proposition most decidedly; if it was true, it might form an argument for keeping the Asylum to as low a number of inmates as possible.

We beg our Christian friends not to come to the conclusion that we do not recognise the importance of having a Church connected with the Asylum, but to assert that the Blind Inmates are as it were tolerated and supported only, that a Church may exist in Bride-street, Dublin, is a false position, and to prop up and tell absolute falsehoods to support this view, and to put down fair enquiry as to the expenditure of the Funds, is not the way to bring down a blessing on any object. If we imagine we can bring glory to God by committing evil, we are in the situation of Saul, when the Prophet of the Lord met him, and said:—"hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings, and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord! Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."—1 Sam. xv. 22.

If any one wishes to peruse a copy of the Trust Deed, *by which the Trustees should have been guided*, let him call at Mr. Allnutt's office, 61, Middle Abbey-street, Dublin, and he will read that the Asylum for the Blind is the first object to be upheld. Read what Mr. Crosthwaite, the son of the founder, writes as follows:—

"21, Mount Pleasant Avenue, May 13, 1856.

"MY DEAR SIR—The more I have considered your laudable zeal in behalf of the *original intention* of the Molyneux establishment, the more I find in it to command attention and respect. I had a conversation since we met with Mr. McCalley, and I am glad to be able to say, that my impressions of the founding of the Asylum were correct. The deed of trust will fully set forth that the primary intention has not been as fully kept in view as it should. *There were several inmates before there were any place of worship for them*; so much for the accuracy of the information of others. In my father's time, I am informed, *everything* was reported in print. There is a very worthy man, rector of Ballinrobe, the Rev. James Anderson, who can, perhaps, give some assistance in the inquiry. I am persuaded that, under Providence, the welfare of the Institution is now in the balance, and that your exertions may be the means of bringing it fairly under *public notice*, from its foundation to the present hour. Wishing you every success, I remain, yours very truly,

"DAVENPORT CROSTHWAITE."

Mr. Allnutt then wrote to the Rev. James Anderson, and he also corroborated Mr. Crosthwaite's statements.

Secondly, the Trustees say they have carefully examined the ac-

counts, and that the balance-sheet of 1855 has their entire sanction. We dare say, the Trustees flatter themselves that no one ought to question the accuracy of the accounts, when *they have sanctioned such*.

Railway Directors and other bodies should take the hint from the Trustees of the Molyneux Asylum, and whenever their subscribers require the accounts to be audited, they can adopt the words of the Trustees, and exclaim, "*The accounts have been examined by us, and have received our entire sanction ;*" in fact, it appears to be the opinion of the Trustees, that Auditors are very unnecessary gentlemen. Insurance Companies, Banking Companies, and all Societies, why do you employ auditors to examine your accounts? *do it yourselves, and your subscribers must be satisfied with your entire sanction !*

Thirdly—The Trustees declare that the management of the Asylum has never been entrusted to any other person. This is positively untrue, for every one in Dublin who knows anything of the Asylum, is perfectly aware the Rev. C. Fleury was everything; indeed he managed the whole concern. That its pecuniary affairs have been invariably administered, through their Sub-Treasurer, by the Trustees themselves. This also is not fact, if the body of Trustees include Mr. Harris and the Matron, we fully admit that the Trustees are correct in what they state; but if Mr. Harris and the Matron are not Trustees, where can be the truth in this statement? The practice for years has been, that Mr. Harris should pay and keep the accounts, and attend the Matron every quarter of a year, to look over her accounts, and take from her any balance that she may have in hand, after payment of a host of things mentioned in her book of incidental expenses. The Matron attended every Sunday, and took the Chapel collections, amounting, in 1855, to £315 5s. 3d.! She paid with this cash the incidental expenses—she paid Kate Read every quarter. The Matron and Mr. Harris cannot belong to the body of Trustees, for the trust deed limits the number to five; other people, it thus appears, have administered the funds of the Asylum.

Fourthly—The Trustees say they were four days investigating the charges against a certain party; we have disposed of this before—the 6th, 7th, and 8th of August cannot make four days, but only three. Then again, they say they were two days reviewing the evidence—we do not wonder it took them two days to get rid of such a mass of clear and direct evidence;—*they laboured for two days, and were at last unanimous*. What could occupy them two days, if the combination and conspiracy amongst the poor inmates, and also the innocency of the party, was so apparent; besides, we beg to remind our readers, that, before the investigation broke up, the chairman pronounced the party innocent, and Dr. Stanford,

offered to give a testimonial whenever requested (see page 54). The meeting for two days was, consequently, quite unnecessary.

There appears nothing more to be particularly noticed, excepting the signatures of the Trustees to this document, stating that everything has been and is correct. It is extraordinary that Dr. Stanford should have signed this paper, as he admitted at the meeting he knew nothing of the Asylum. Mr. Bickerstaff, one would have supposed, might have excused himself, for he has made no secret, in telling others that he has been desirous of putting affairs in the right course, but has always been put down by Mr. Fleury. We are really very much surprised that Surgeon Smyly should have added his name; he only became a Trustee about one month before he signed the paper; he might with equal reason have given a certificate of a man's health, and yet have never examined the party. Did each Trustee really sign the document? See how this was managed as respects the ladies in the following page.

Now we cannot conclude this review of the Trustees' document, without speaking of the visiting ladies. We would not desire to have said one word respecting the ladies, had not their names appeared in print, stating that, "*from their past and present experience*, they do hereby certify, that the management, food, clothing, and comfort of the inmates are, in every respect, carefully provided for." Signed by:—

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Maria Anne Moore. | 7. Mary Jackson. |
| 2. Caroline Lloyd. | 8. Mary Rogers. |
| 3. Mary Wilson. | 9. Louisa Gaskin. |
| 4. Elizabeth Boileau.* | 10. Jane Conolly. |
| 5. Mary Queale. | 11. Sarah Peters. |
| 6. Jane Smith. | |

Now we beg emphatically to assert, that *not one* of these eleven ladies attended the Asylum as *Visiting Ladies* in 1855, and, with the exception of only three, none of them are known at the Asylum. Mrs. Moore was one of the visiting ladies nine years ago; Mrs. Boileau has been a reading lady for some years, not a Visiting Lady, but is on the most intimate terms with the Matron; and it is said that this lady has been in the habit of looking over the Matron's accounts, if so, she must know something about the extra quantity of Porter and Tea, the Raisins, &c., &c. Her evidence will be important to us if the matter is brought in a Court of Law. One of the ladies mentioned is the *expectant New Matron*. Miss Jackson, another reading lady, as she perfectly well knows, could not well decline signing the paper, because *she was under a great obligation to Mr. Fleury, in getting Mary Callaghan taken into the Asylum without an Election*. We assert that all the other eight ladies knew nothing whatever about the internal affairs of the Asylum, and we believe some of them were scarcely ever in the

* We are requested to state that, to prevent mistake, this lady is Mrs. John Theophilus Boileau.

place before that day. Amongst all this appearance of putting forward the names of eleven parties as Visiting Ladies, when these parties know right well that they never attended one meeting in the whole of the year 1855; amongst all this pretence, we are thankful to be able to say, that one lady was found to refuse to sign this certificate. We know not how to express our respect for such a witness for the truth. The Committee alludes to this fact in "*Statement*," page 37; and we beg to apologise to Miss Pollock, should she feel annoyed by having her name mentioned; indeed this lady has been a most kind friend and reader (not a visiting lady), to the inmates of the Asylum, for the last six years: and we should be happy beyond measure, if Miss Pollock and fourteen ladies in a similar position in life, would form the Committee of Visiting Ladies. When two clergymen presented the paper for the ladies to sign, *they did as they were requested*, but Miss Pollock declined—all honour is due to her. These two Clergymen were Dr. Stanford and Mr. Fleury. Miss Jane Conolly was not present at the meeting, but Dr. Stanford said Mr. Fleury could sign for her as she was his first cousin, and he knew that she would have no objection.

Some may ask, where is the difference between a Visiting Lady and a Reader? Why the greatest possible difference; the Visiting Lady is appointed for life by the Trust Deed, of equal power with the Trustees, she may really be termed a *female Trustee*; she has power at any time she pleases to look into everything connected with the clothing, food, comfort, and conduct of the inmates. Whereas a mere reader, attends only between the hours of 12 and 2 o'clock in the day to read a chapter in the Bible, as it were spontaneously of her own accord; she is there by sufferance only; she takes on herself no responsibility whatever, and she has no right to interfere; she never attends any Committee of ladies; in short, if the inmates were starved, no one could blame a reading lady. What can she know of their food? She leaves the Asylum as soon as the chapter is read before or when their dinner bell rings; it is of course a kind act on her side, but no more.

There are so many tricks and falsehoods to be exposed, that as fast as we demolish one, another rises to the surface. We have been doing an injustice to the ten other ladies, who we have said signed the certificate; it now appears that Mr. Fleury himself *signed all their names*; the ladies were present, and it may be said by Mr. Fleury and Dr. Stanford, that they gave their assent. That may be true, but the ladies (with the exception of Miss Pollock), expressed their approval of the *present arrangements*. The certificate Mr. Fleury signed says, "*past and present!*" If this matter is brought into a Court of Justice, we shall get to the bottom of the whole of this, and *other transactions*. Dr. Stanford brought into the room two certificates; we beg to

acquaint him, it is very possible we know far more than we have patience to write. One word of caution, we have heard of *very wicked things* which are said to have been spoken of the Chaplain and his sons, by some of the inmates, and we have been enabled to trace these reports to a relation of Mr. Fleury; we say to this person, BEWARE, for the poor blind women have friends who are both able and willing, to bring an action on their behalf against him for *slander*.

If the inmates are such bad characters as Mr. Fleury's friends would have us believe, why has not Mr. Fleury, the Chaplain, brought the case forward before the Trustees, and caused the inmates to be expelled who have been guilty of such an offence? Could Mr. Fleury have believed these reports to have emanated from the inmates, and at the same time, say nothing to them about it? and would his son ask the women *to go into the Chapel and practice singing with him* (which they declined)? and would Mr. Fleury allow his son and some young men to take possession of the Organ Loft, and officiate on Sunday evening, the 22nd of February last (see page 42)? We tell the friends of Mr. Fleury, that they themselves have circulated and spread abroad the aspersions against him, and then they get *people who are not aware of the truth*, to pull down the very *shams* stuck up by Mr. Fleury's friends! The "*gross fabrications*" are their own offspring; at all events we are not the authors of the "*fabrications*."

The manufacture of the manifesto of the Trustees, is also a specimen of the length to which people will go, to gain their ends. We all know that the certificate of the Trustees, and also that from the ladies, was printed on one and the same piece of paper; in fact these two certificates occupied one side of a letter sized sheet of paper, to appear as though the Trustees and the ladies executed the document in each other's presence. We feel ashamed for the parties who have been guilty of such a mean subterfuge—nothing of the sort took place, the facts are as follows. The Trustee's certificate was on a separate piece of paper, and it was read to the ladies *before* the Trustees signed it, of course for the purpose of influencing them to allow their names to be added to the Ladies' Certificate. The Ladies were informed that the Trustees would attach their signatures *afterwards* to the second paper or certificate. Whether the Trustees allowed Mr. Fleury to follow the same course, and sign the documents for the Trustees, or whether each Trustee signed the document for himself, we do not know; but both papers were put together, and appeared in print as one document.

We know perfectly well that after the first meeting, when the management of the Asylum became the subject of conversation, the Chaplain was most anxious to make it appear that the visiting ladies had not ceased to be. We are quite aware that applications

were made to various ladies to become the Visiting Committee. We are also aware that a lady of eminence, residing in Dublin, was applied to for the purpose of being Guardian, but all declined, and they still hold back *until* the management of the Asylum has been put in some sort of respectable order.

We will now turn to a more agreeable topic, namely, a visit Mr. Allnutt has lately made to the London School for the Blind, in the Avenue Road, near Regent's Park, and we will give it in his own words:—

On entering the hall, I noticed a Visitor's book on the table, with a box for contributions; and after being shown over part of the house, which need not here be referred to, I walked into the large sitting room, in which I found about twenty females knitting, and at the same time they were receiving singing lessons from a lady presiding at the piano. I could not but see the advantage and great convenience of having an instrument in the warm room of the inmates, instead of compelling those who wish to practice to go into the vestry room, as in the Molyneux.

There were two fires in this room; and there stood a fine large globe, about three feet in diameter, with the boundaries of the various countries raised, and the cities were marked with metal studs, so that the blind inmates, or pupils (as they are here called), were soon enabled to know the situation of various countries.

My attention was then drawn to the excellent and extensive library of embossed books, *printed in the house*, which were in constant use, twice a day. A regular school mistress was always engaged, besides a music mistress frequently attending. After I was in the room a short time, reading was commenced, and I counted fourteen so employed, whilst four continued working, and another was practising on the organ. The following are the school arrangements:—

MORNING.

| | | |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| 9 | o'clock— | Open with prayer. |
| 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ | „ | Learning Scripture. |
| 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ | „ | Lucas's system for reading to be repeated. |
| 10 | „ | Reading lessons; the whole school. |
| 11 to 12 | „ | Working hour. |

AFTERNOON.

| | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| 2 | o'clock— | Open with prayer. |
| 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ | „ | Reading lessons. |
| 3 | „ | Working hour. |
| 4 | „ | History, grammar, spelling. |
| 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ | „ | School closes with prayer. |

During the working hours, arithmetic is taught; and on Mondays and Thursdays, writing lessons are given. Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday, Geography, by embossed charts or maps.

Music lessons are given by a master, to seven pupils on the Organ, and to five on the Piano-forte.

Presently one of the Visiting Ladies came into the room, and prepared to read to the inmates; in a few minutes four ladies and a gentleman entered, and after hearing some of the girls read, they had the gratification of seeing one little girl work a sum in arithmetic, by Lucas's method; she put down the various figures told her, four rows of four figures each row, and she proceeded to add them up, which she accomplished without an error. It is fact that a blind woman taught the arithmetic. Another girl then exhibited her knowledge of Geography, by means of a kind of thick piece of mill-board, about eighteen inches long, by a foot in width, on which the boundaries of countries were raised, as in the globe we have alluded to.

As the ladies expressed the pleasure they felt in witnessing the interesting acts of these blind girls, I could not avoid reflecting in my mind on the neglect in which the inmates of the Molyneux were living. What a delightful thing it would be to see several of the women in our Asylum sitting down with their books to read; (how could they now when only two New Testaments are to be found amongst nearly *thirty* inmates?) and would not those who are fond of music enjoy the benefit of lessons every week on the Organ and piano-forte.

The dietary of the London School for the Blind is as follows:—

MONDAY.—Boiled mutton and potatoes; boiled rice with sugar.

TUESDAY.—Roast beef and potatoes; plain suet pudding.

WEDNESDAY.—Roast mutton and potatoes; pudding.

THURSDAY.—Mutton and veal; greens and potatoes; pudding.

FRIDAY.—Beef steak pie and potatoes; pudding.

SATURDAY.—Mutton and potatoes; bread pudding.

SUNDAY.—Cold roast beef and potatoes; hot plum pudding.

Meat, and often soup, bread, potatoes, and greens, with pudding, is the dinner each day of the week.

BREAKFAST.—Tea, Coffee or Cocoa, with bread and butter.

TEA.—Tea, bread and butter.

SUPPER.—Bread and cheese.

(See dietary of the Molyneux, in page 20, very different to the above).

The cost of maintenance was £13 7s. 8d. (see page 19), considerably under that of the Molyneux Asylum, which was £20 12s each inmate. On referring to the last Report of this London Blind School, we find the average cost of maintenance to be about £11.

In the room where the organ stood, a neat glass case attracted my attention, filled with various articles made by the blind inmates. I had a long conversation with the Matron, and the Assistant Secretary, who invited me to attend a public performance of music, which takes place the first Monday in the month. The admission is free, by tickets, obtained (postage free) from the Secretary.

On leaving the Institution I was requested to enter my name in

the visitor's book, and I then departed, exceedingly pleased with what I had seen, but still much cast-down, in reflecting what an amount of hard work the friends of the Molyneux Asylum have before them, if they desire that Institution to be conducted in similar manner.

I forgot to mention that the London School for the Blind has a managing committee of Gentlemen, as well as of Ladies; that the former body choose amongst themselves a finance committee, who meet every month, and make their report to the managing committee at their monthly meeting, and I think the Trustees of the Molyneux Asylum would do well to adopt the rules of the London Society, *as they have admitted they have no rules of their own* (page 18). I would further beg leave to suggest, that Lucas's system should be adopted in teaching the blind to read, as it is acquired with the utmost facility.

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

LONDON SOCIETY FOR TEACHING THE BLIND TO READ;

IN T. M. LUCAS'S EMBOSSED STENOGRAPHIC CHARACTERS.

SOLD, BOUND IN HALF CLOTH, BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS; BY THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY, 10 EARL STREET, BLACKFRIARS; AND BY MESSRS. NISBET, BERNERS STREET; AND AT THE INSTITUTION, AVENUE ROAD, REGENT'S PARK.

| | s. | d. |
|--|----|----|
| Genesis, in two volumes | 8 | 0 |
| Exodus ditto | 8 | 0 |
| Leviticus | 4 | 8 |
| Numbers, in two volumes | 8 | 0 |
| Deuteronomy, ditto | 6 | 8 |
| Joshua | 4 | 0 |
| Judges and Ruth | 4 | 0 |
| 1 Samuel | 4 | 8 |
| 2 Samuel | 4 | 8 |
| 1 Kings | 4 | 8 |
| 2 Kings | 4 | 4 |
| 1 Chronicles | 4 | 4 |
| 2 Chronicles | 4 | 8 |
| Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther | 4 | 8 |
| Job | 4 | 0 |
| Psalms, in two volumes | 8 | 8 |
| Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon | 4 | 8 |
| Isaiah, in two volumes | 7 | 4 |
| Jeremiah and Lamentations, ditto | 8 | 8 |
| Ezekiel, ditto | 8 | 0 |
| Daniel, Hosea, and Joel | 4 | 0 |
| Amos to Malachi | 4 | 8 |
| Matthew (third edition) | 4 | 4 |
| Mark (second do.) | 3 | 8 |
| Luke (Ditto) | 4 | 8 |

| | s. | d. |
|--|----|----|
| John | 4 | 0 |
| Acts | 4 | 8 |
| Romans | 2 | 8 |
| Corinthians to Ephesians, inclusive | 4 | 0 |
| Philippians to Hebrews, ditto | 4 | 0 |
| James to Revelation, ditto | 4 | 0 |
| Liturgy | 4 | 8 |
| Occasional Services | 5 | 0 |
| Prayer-book Psalms, in two volumes | 8 | 8 |
| Prayers, Meditations, and Hymns | 4 | 8 |
| Hymn Book, embossed by the Blind Pupils in 1845 | 1 | 4 |
| Scripture Lessons | 0 | 6 |
| The Church Catechism, with Scripture References | 1 | 4 |
| An Inquirer and the Bible: A Tract | 1 | 4 |

I give the following extract from the last report of the London School for the Blind, on the value of Lucas's system :—

“Every one is aware, that, with those who see, the eye glances instantaneously over many lines at a time, whilst for the blind, who can only feel by the touch, it is desirable that the characters should be of the simplest form, and such that the momentary touch of the finger should distinguish the difference, and, at the same time, they should occupy the least space possible. In every other known system the characters selected consist for the most part of more than one stroke, as horizontal and vertical, or two or more diagonals, combined in one letter. In Lucas's system every letter is simply a straight line, or a semicircle in four different positions: by attaching a dot or crochet head to the right or left, at the top or bottom of each character, every variety needful for the alphabet or double letters is obtained: the finger instantaneously detects the difference by the position of the dot, and recognizes the letter: the characters are thus brought into closer space, and many are able to read with one hand, while the other, held at the beginning of the line, enables the finger to return to the next line without danger of omission or repetition.”

Our readers must pardon our having digressed so far from the subject of the Molyneux Asylum, Dublin, and we must now be allowed to return to that Institution, and at once to submit to their consideration the chief features of the Trust Deed of 1815 :—

COMPARISON OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TRUST DEED, WITH THE ACTUAL STATE OF THINGS AT THE MOLYNEUX ASYLUM IN 1855-6.

IMPORTANT EXTRACTS.

FACTS.

1. Dated 15th May, 1815, by and between Henry Wilmot, William Pasley, Alexander Ferrier, William L. Guinness, and William C. Hogan.

2. The Institution to be an Asylum for Blind Females advanced in years, and a school for the instruction of younger females labouring under the privation of sight.

2. No one can pretend for an instant that a school has been carried on! Where are the teachers? the scholars? the books?

3. Provides that the donations, subscriptions, *together with the Chapel collections*, to be made during and after Divine Service, shall be paid into the hands of the Treasurer of the said Institution, who must also be a Trustee (see No. 7).

3. The Matron has received the chapel collections, and Mr. Harris (not a Trustee), has attended to the accounts.

4. That the Collections shall be entered in a book, and this to be signed by one of the Collectors and the Chaplain.

4. Has this been actually done? For further particulars of the entries in this Book, see page 51.

5. When the Collections amount to £10, the amount must be lodged with the Treasurer of the said Asylum.

5. Has this also been the practice? How could the money be lodged with the Treasurer, and yet at the same time, remain in the Matron's hands?

6. Trustees must meet at least every three months.

6. Has this been done? At least we mean a Quorum!

7. One of the Trustees must be appointed Sub-Treasurer on the 1st of May, each year, who is bound to keep all the accounts; and these must be vouched every quarter.

7. See observation to No. 3, where it will appear Mr. Harris (not a Trustee) has kept the Accounts.

8. The duty of the Secretary is to issue all notices for all meetings, and call together the Trustees, Guardian, and Visitors.

8. The Guardian and Visiting Ladies have not been in existence for at least nine years! Had Mr. Fleury constantly sent out notices, would he have used printed forms *last April, signed by Dr. Marks*, who has left the Asylum about ten years? —see page 29.

9. The person appointed, Minister, or Chaplain, shall reside in the Asylum, in order that he may the better attend to and discharge the several duties of his office and situation.

9. The present Chaplain *has never resided in the house*; nor would he allow the Minister whom he appointed to reside in the Asylum, *to interfere in the slightest degree*

10. Provided always, and it is hereby declared and agreed, that the Minister or Chaplain of this Institution, shall not use or exercise any other lucrative situation, profession, or employment whatsoever.

10. Also flagrantly disregarded by the Trustees. The Chaplain has a large school; it is against the positive directions of the Trust Deed.

11. That a lady must be appointed as Guardian, and also fifteen ladies as a body of Visiting Ladies.

11. Certainly as utterly disregarded and lost sight of as Nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. The Visiting Ladies *now alluded to are mere children*, as respects the time they have been in existence as such, but still on referring to page 62, they pretend to look into the past, and declare all *has been* excellent.

12. Trustees and Guardian, and remaining Visiting Ladies, to fill up vacancies.

12. There has been no Guardian, and no Visiting Ladies could legally have been appointed without her!

13. The Trustees, Guardian, and Visiting Ladies to manage and superintend the Asylum for Blind Female Adult, and the School for the Blind Female Children, and shall in conjunction appoint, control, and revise as often as occasion shall require, all such offices—Matrons, Mistresses, and Servants, as may from time to time be deemed necessary.

13. Nothing of the kind could have been done, as there has been no Guardian and Visiting Ladies for years; in fact the Matron alone has had sole authority for engaging and dismissing the Assistant Matron and Servants, who are consequently completely under her control. The Matron dismissed Margaret Ring, and also Maria Franklin, which acts are contrary to the Trust Deed.

14. Three Trustees at least shall at all times be necessary to render valid and effectual any order, direction, rule, or regulation, or other matter or thing to be done; it being intended that not less than three Trustees shall form a Quorum for the transacting of any business.

14. Very important clause. The Trustees "*Minute Book*" will show whether this has been attended to.

15. A Trustee wishing to resign must give three months notice in writing to his Co-Trustees, through the Secretary; and upon the death or resignation of a Trustee, another must be unanimously appointed, so that the number of five Trustees may always be kept up.

15. We have no means *as yet*, of knowing what notice Mr. Ferrier gave his Co-Trustees when he left them. Dr. Bigger received a letter from Mr. Ferrier, stating he would meet the Committee only about two days prior to Dr. Churchill's note—see page 13.

TEN out of Fourteen stipulations of the "*Trust Deed*," can be proved to have been utterly disregarded by the present Trustees, viz., Nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, & 13!

This Trust Deed gives no power whatever to the Trustees to add to, or increase their number; consequently without the intervention of the Court of Chancery, the five Trustees had no power whatever to elect their Clerical Trustees by a Deed they executed ten years afterwards, dated 18th February, 1825. Dr. Stanford being a Clerical Trustee, and having been appointed by virtue of the Deed of 1825, has no standing

right, or title whatever to act as a Trustee, in any way ; and as we believe he now stands in the light of some of the Trustees *attempting* to do what is right, we beg to point out to them, that Dr. Stanford has no real right or title to over-awe, nullify, or obstruct any Trustee in the exertions of his duty.

We know all about Mr. Bickerstaff's efforts to remove the Matron, and we are also fully acquainted of Dr. Stanford's *protesting that no motion shall be brought forward for her removal*. Every one understands a *protest* being made when a motion is carried, against the wish of certain parties ; but to prevent a motion being put, is a new doctrine of Dr. Stanford's own invention. If a Layman acted as he does, he would be considered somewhat of a *bully*—but we suppose when a Clergyman adopts such a course, it is quite a different thing—we presume it must then be said that the Rev. Dr. Stanford is *energetically persuasive*.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We are really advocating or insisting on one great principle, which is, "That the Managers of any Society or Institution, no matter for what object it is established, are bound to render an annual account to their Subscribers, of the monies they have received and disbursed." This is the chief matter at issue between us and the Trustees—we have not charged the Chaplain, the Rev. Charles M. Fleury with any offence, excepting a want of civility in certain instances ; but it has clearly transpired that he has grossly neglected his duty, and we will plainly give our reasons. First, he the Chaplain has not resided in the House (see the 9th requirement of the Trust Deed, page 68). Secondly, before Mr. Fleury allows another Clergyman to occupy the apartments (he should dwell in the Asylum), Mr. Fleury binds him down not to interfere in the least degree. Thirdly, the Chaplain of the Asylum, Mr. Fleury, becomes the Principal of a boy's school (see the 10th Section of the Trust Deed, page 68), and Fourthly, Mr. Fleury, as appears by the evidence of the Inmates, *never attends the Asylum to give them religious instruction* beyond his duty in the Chapel on Sundays and Tuesdays (see the evidence, page 36, &c). The Rev. C. M. Fleury receives £400 per annum for his services, and yet it is apparent he has not complied with the requirements of the Trust Deed ; and however the Trustees may try to excuse themselves for not having acted according to the Trust Deed, we know not how Mr. Fleury, the Secretary of the Institution could be ignorant of the plain provisions of the Deed, by which this Asylum exists.

Somehow or other, whenever we attempted to make the Trustees accountable, Mr. Fleury stood between us and them, and it seems as though we cannot speak to the Trustees but through the Chaplain, and if so, we simply ask, is it because a man is a Clergyman, that he is to be exempted from giving an account ?

By referring to page 28, Mr. Fleury declared to us at the election last April, that *no one wanted an account*, and that the Trustees

would not publish another Report *for five years* ; he might as well have said five and twenty years. We are both Protestants, but we have yet to learn, that when a body of men are Protestants, and become Trustees to a Charitable Institution, they cease to be accountable beings ; they are but mortals, and when the receipts amount to £1,500 per annum, it looks, to say the least of it, exceedingly strange the Trustees should be so unwilling to have a proper annual printed report, and duly audited accounts.

As to what was said at the large meeting, that was intended to put the extinguisher on all our efforts ; to settle *us* as well as the righteous cause of the poor blind women. Why we care no more about the meeting or the speakers, than if they never existed. Our cause has acquired an hundred fold greater strength from all the bluster, for this simple reason, *that it was no answer !* We will however ask the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, Q.C., a few questions, he is reported to have said at the meeting referred to (we copy from "Saunders's News" of the 31st December, 1856). "I am not one of those who, if any charge be pointed against a person, would rashly say that I acquit him in the first instance, and then try him afterwards, because I had a complete communication with those who sifted and tried this matter to the utmost, and not only had every charge been proved upon investigation, to be totally unfounded, but I am assured there is the clearest evidence that they sprung from malignant fabrication (hear, hear)." We ask Mr. Napier was it prudent for a sound lawyer to arrive at conclusions on *ex parte* evidence ? On examining the subject, who does he allude to as those who sifted and tried this matter to the utmost ? Why, the Trustees and their supporters. We consider Mr. Napier has indeed been very rash in making the above declaration at a public meeting, and we believe he will live to acknowledge that he did not act wisely ! Did he, in any way, seek or ask for information from us or the Committee desirous for Reform ? No indeed, he did not, he joined the Hue and Cry without considering that there are always two sides to a question. If he has been assured there is the clearest evidence of malignant fabrication, why does he not expose it to the public ? The first fabrication he can commence on is that of the blind boy, Owen Dowell, being in the Molyneux—it would be a very nice subject for the first experiment !

One word more about the meeting in the Rotundo, and the presentation of the piece of plate to the Rev. C. M. Fleury. No one seemed to care or say a word about the poor blind inmates of the Molyneux ; their grand object was to exculpate Mr. Fleury *at all hazard*. As to the blind women no one cared one jot or tittle. These poor inmates, if they had been present at the meeting, could have said in the words of Joab to David :—

"For thou hast declared this day that thou regardest neither princes nor servants ; for this day I perceive that if Absalom had

lived, and all we had died this day, then it had pleased thee well."—2 Sam. xix. 6.

And in short the proceedings of that meeting and the conduct of the Trustees especially, from first to last, in all this painful business, is best met by the words of our Lord to the Pharisees:—"Ye are they which justify yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."—Luke xvi. 15.

We have so much to advance as to the truth of our complaints, that were we to write all we know of the proceedings at the Molyneux instead of a small pamphlet, we have ample materials for a couple of volumes; unfortunately so many schemes have been adopted to smother the enquiries as to the management of the Asylum, that it is utterly impossible to lay bare all the falsehoods without entering into much detail; however, we imagine we have said enough; yet, little facts turn up day after day—here is one of no little importance. Through the kindness of a friend we have just had placed in our hands a Report of the Molyneux, dated 27th April, 1818. It is a very interesting statement, and the accounts are actually audited by two gentlemen, whose names are, Hugh Dick, and John Barton, Mary-street. The Trustees of the present day, as we have shown, do not like to trouble anyone to audit their Accounts. Well, this Report alludes to the School in these words, page 8—"Three vacancies were filled, and in place of the two old women who died since the opening of the Asylum, two pupils were added to the School, so that two women are now in the Life Asylum, and *fourteen in the School of the Institution*, being an increase of two to the former number upon the Establishment." We think the ladies and clergymen in Dublin will see in this short sentence very much matter for reflection. The intention of the Founders, was, as we have said again and again, to have an Asylum for the old, and a School for the young; therefore, without any hesitation, we acquaint them that the Molyneux Asylum should afford instruction to a number of blind children, as far as the funds will allow; they should attend the School from any part of Dublin they can be found. Oh! what a blessed object to contemplate! how our hearts are warmed when we think what the Molyneux should be!—but how our spirits sink when we reflect how the Institution has fallen from its first estate, *not for want of funds*, but from the *total neglect of its Trustees*. We believe the time is now arrived when Trustees must be forced to cast away the garment of *indifference* and *sloth*, and gird themselves with another costume; but how can it be expected that Trustees, who have cared so little, can be depended on to change their habits? We do not expect it in the least degree. We have no confidence whatever in them; some people have announced a grand discovery, that the Trustees have at last made *an effort*. There has been an evident advance,

an improvement!—what is it? why, Potatoes now are provided for the inmates on five days in the week! And another reformation has been made—the salt fish is now the Thursday's dinner instead of Friday's—*what a very important change!!* We have heard that Mr. Fleury said it looked too Popish! Perhaps it was not he but the Trustees made the remark, but it was rather strange they did not discover this years back!

Now we should believe what the Trustees assert, and if you refer to their manifesto, you will find they acknowledge *they have done their best!* “They have endeavoured hitherto, as they hope to *persevere*, (in doing nothing) to fulfil the obligations connected with their trust, conscientiously and efficiently, fearlessly and impartially.” We do not agree with them as to their idea of having done their duty, and, therefore, the best way of settling the dispute is, to apply to the Court of Chancery without any more delay, and pray the Lord Chancellor to examine the Trust Deed, and see if the Trustees have fulfilled its provisions—if they have, we are in the wrong; if, however, they are in the wrong, we must pray his Lordship to relieve the present Trustees of their responsibility, and appoint five other Trustees, and also we shall pray his Lordship to appoint the Guardian and fifteen Visiting Ladies, and furthermore, we shall endeavour to have the Trust Deed amended or improved, so as to admit of the appointment of three Clerical Trustees, and a Committee of Management of about 9 gentlemen, to assist the Trustees in carrying out the intentions of the Founders of the Molyneux Asylum for Blind Females, and School for children suffering under the privation of sight. Of course we must pray for an examination of the amounts from 1830, *up to the present time.*

In all our doings we would hope and pray to be guided by God. We have no rancorous feelings towards any person or party; if, in the warmth of the controversy, we have spoken a sharp word, we beg for forgiveness. Our Blessed Saviour said, “If ye love me, keep my Commandments; and my Commandment is, that ye love one another.” We have taken up the cause of the blind women, and will not abandon it or them until we see the dawn of another day, a complete and as far as human efforts go, a perfect eradication of the old system, (if it is worthy of such a title), and the substitution of new life where apathy will be cast aside, and each Trustee, Chaplain, and Matron will do his or her duty. We humbly pray that the blessing of God will rest on our cause, without which nothing is holy, just, and good.

THE LATEST INTELLIGENCE TO THE SUBSCRIBERS,
SHOWING CLEARLY THAT THE TRUSTEES ARE VERY THOUGHTFUL
MEN, AND REGULATED BY A TRUST DEED IN ALL THINGS (PAGE 6).

Mr. Allnutt knowing that his subscription would be due at the end of the present month, sent one of his clerks to Mr. Thomas Evans, the Assistant Secretary, Rutland Square. The following is the very curious result of the interview.

Upon calling on Mr. Evans, and telling him I wished to pay Mr. Allnutt's subscription to the Molyneux Asylum, he replied that he could not receive it, that Mr. Allnutt should either enclose it to the Trustees at a meeting of the Board, or speak to Mr. Bickerstaff, who was their Sub-Treasurer, also a Trustee; and further, that he, Mr. Evans could not receive a subscription from any of the gentlemen who signed* the "Statement" without the sanction of the Trustees, but if directed by Mr. Bickerstaff to give Mr. Allnutt a receipt, he would of course do so. I then applied to Mr. Bickerstaff, telling him the same as to Mr. Evans, he also stated that he could not receive it, that he was not the receiver, nor had he any receipts. I informed him that I had been to Mr. Evans, who had directed me to apply to him for his authority; he then repeated his former statement, distinctly refusing to receive the money.

(Signed T. G.)

Mr. Thomas Evans afterwards called at Mr. Allnutt's Office, and this Gentleman again tendered Evans the guinea; he expressed himself in the same word as above, viz., that without a meeting of the Board of Trustees, no subscriptions would be taken from *any* of the gentlemen who are connected with the movement for the reform of the Molyneux Asylum. Mr. Allnutt then asked Evans, whether he would refuse a subscription from Mr. Frederick Sutton, he declared that he must refuse it, *by order of the Board*.

The Trustees of the Molyneux Asylum, are determined to be very eccentric characters; they won't have their Accounts Audited, and they won't take money to support the Asylum. Strange things happen now a days!

THE VERY LATEST INTELLIGENCE!

This day, the 11th March, 1857, Mr. Thomas Evans, the Assistant Secretary of the Molyneux (the same who refused Mr. Allnutt's subscription yesterday), called this morning on the clerk who attempted to pay the money; and amongst other unfortunate *revelations*, he said Mr. Allnutt did not go the right way to work yesterday, to pay his subscription. Mr.

* Mr. Allnutt's name is not put to the "Statement." On the same grounds, the Income Tax Commissioners will assuredly refuse money from the "*Repealers*," when they hear of the *heroic* determination of these thoughtful Trustees! The gentlemen who signed the "Statement"—the Hon. L. H. King Harman, John F. Aylmer, John Hogan, G. L. Cathcart, William Parker, Frederick Sutton, and William Higginbotham.

Evans did not however enlighten any one as to the true method Mr. Allnutt should adopt, to force the Trustees to accept *Money* !

In reference to the brief notice (page 9), which Mr. Allnutt read to Evans yesterday afternoon, "*stating that the Trustees direct all communication between the visitors and the inmates must be made in the presence of the Matron.*" Mr. Evans, the Assistant Secretary, clearly explained that "the Trustees were compelled to issue such an order, to prevent certain ladies *running in and out* of the Asylum, and *tampering* with the inmates. The Assistant Secretary did not leave Mr. Allnutt's clerk in doubt as to who the ladies were, but he without any hesitation, mentioned the names of Miss Blackburne and Miss Peile ! These ladies must remember we are only giving the words of Mr. Evans, the Assistant Secretary. Oh ! how true are the words of Scripture, "*Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee.*" The Trustees and their Chaplain and Assistant Secretary, cannot open their mouth for one minute, without uttering words that rise up in accusation against them !

What superlative insolence, that two ladies of such known worth, should be accused of *tampering* with the inmates of the Molyneux ! Mr. Evans, is a very civil man, he only acts according to his orders. Surely, he added, "you would not like any one to *tamper* with your clerks !"

The Veil is but partly withdrawn. Further communications are held over for pamphlet No. 4, which will appear if necessary.

Oh ! ye prudent Trustees ! had ye been wise when the opportunity was given you, *all would have been well* !

THE SUBSCRIBERS TO THE MOLYNEUX ASYLUM MAY BE THUS CLASSIFIED.

Class A.—Parties who pay their subscriptions like *Lambs* ! are perfectly satisfied with every thing anyone does or says ! and carefully abstain from asking the Trustees or the Chaplain any questions !

Class B.—Ill-natured people in their hearts, (however smiles may grace their countenances), who are dissatisfied, and who are so unreasonable as to *wish for* audited accounts and explanations ! but who at the same time stifle all their feelings, and pocket the affront ; they also never give a hint of their opinions to other men, but pay their subscriptions like real gentlemen, as if they are *fond* of the present system.

Class C.—People who wish to pay their subscriptions, "*but won't be LET*" by the Collector, or Assistant Secretary, without a certificate from a Trustee, that "*all's well.*" The motives of Class C, must be evil, they entertain sentiments as Class B, but have the audacity, and presumption to speak out boldly ! Rebels, of this stamp, must be put down by *Monster Public Meetings*, and with all the rigour of the Law.



3 0112 072361048

LETTER RECEIVED SUBSEQUENT TO THE PUBLICATION
OF THE FIRST EDITION OF THIS PAMPHLET.

The Glebe, Ballinrobe, Co. Mayo,
March 16, 1857.

"DEAR SIR,

"I have to thank you for the Pamphlet respecting the Molyneux Asylum.

"I am glad indeed that you are making an effort for its restoration, and the carrying out the intentions of my former friend the Rev. John Crosthwaite, whom you justly speak of as the Founder of the Institution.

"I had the privilege of residing with him, and of witnessing his great exertions to advance the temporal and spiritual welfare of the poor blind females.

"In my time the Trustees, three at least attended divine service in the Chapel, and the Collections were invariably locked up in two boxes, one inside the other, while a key of each was kept by a different party, a Trustee and the Chaplain.

"I sincerely hope that the Trust Deed will be laid before the Chancellor or proper authorities, if need be, and the Chaplain obliged to restrict himself to the care of the Asylum and Chapel Congregation, without embarking in other pursuits contrary to the letter and spirit of his appointment. He has doubtless an adequate salary, and an Assistant beside also paid.

"Very differently were Mr. Crosthwaite's services requited, but 'he had respect to the recompence of the (great) reward,' and 'was not chargeable to any one.' He served the Institution (founded by his own exertions), gratuitously for years, with the exception of the advantage of the residence (*for he did reside*), and gave to the Chapel an organ, which he told me cost him £200.

"The Visiting Ladies too attended in daily rotation, and every thing went on happily for a long time; while the comforts of the inmates were most carefully attended to, as of primary importance.

"By your account a thorough reformation is much needed.

"I am, Dear Sir,

"Your's very faithfully,
"JAMES ANDERSON.

H. Allnutt, Esq.

P.S.—I can have no object in wishing success to your efforts, but that the interests of the Institution may be served thereby, if possible, and the memory of my late friend, Mr. Crosthwaite respected, in the full execution of the Trust Deed.

J. A.